University of Venda
Creating Future Leaders

Situational and dispositional factors influencing workplace bullying among police officers in Limpopo Province, South Africa

By

Mokwape Jane Makgopa

(19020910)

Master of Commerce in **Human Resource Management**

In the

Faculty of Management, Commerce, and Law, University of Venda

Supervisor: Dr. W Munyeka

Co-Supervisor: Dr. KE Khashane

January 2023

DECLARATION

I, Makgopa Mokwape Jane of student number 19020910 hereby declare that the dissertation titled *"Situational and Dispositional Factors influencing Workplace Bullying amongst Police Officers in Limpopo province, South Africa"* hereby submitted by me for a Master of Commerce in Human Resource Management at the University of Venda, has not previously been submitted for a degree at this or any other institution and that this is my work in design and execution, and that all reference material contained therein has been duly acknowledged.

Date: January 2023

Signature:

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the situational and dispositional factors influencing workplace bullying among police officers in Limpopo province, South Africa. Situational factors such as power imbalance and organisational climate and dispositional factors such as personality traits contribute to the escalation of workplace bullying. A self-administered questionnaire was used to collect data from a sample of 208 participants, using the simple random sampling technique. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 26.0 was used to perform descriptive and inferential statistics (Correlation and ANOVA) on the obtained data. Negative Acts Questionnaire-Revised was used to collect data on workplace bullying, Big Five Inventory-10 was used to collect data on the dispositional factors, and Riverside Situational Q-Sort was utilised to collect data on the situational factors. The results revealed that there was a positive significant relationship between dispositional factors and workplace bullying, and there was also a positive relationship between situational factors and workplace bullying. Therefore, this study concludes that dispositional and situational factors have an influence in bullying amongst police officers.

Keywords: Dispositional factors, Personality traits, Situational factors, Workplace bullying, Police

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to take this opportunity to express my sincere and deepest gratitude to the following people:

- ❖ Firstly, I would like to thank the Almighty God for this research project, for every good gift comes from above. Nothing could have taken place without Your Mercy and Grace. All Thanks and Praises are due to Him.

- ❖ My mother, Makgopa Khuele Anna, who offered me greatest inspiration, support, motivation, and sacrifices throughout my studies ,and, my loving children, Letsobana and Tshepo Makgopa.

- ❖ My supervisor, Dr. W Munyeka, and my co-supervisor, Dr. KE Khashane. Thank you for never giving up on me, even when I gave up on myself. You guided me with patience and compassion all the way. Your encouragement meant the world to me. May you always prosper in everything that you do.

- ❖ Professor S.S Babalola. Thank you for starting this journey with me, I really appreciate your hardwork and guidance. are appreciated.

- ❖ Hon D.K Mohuba, Councilor H.F Mathavha, Ms. E Takalo, and Mr. X Mabila of Mngoni Civils, thank you for your support and always believing in me.

- ❖ South African Police Service's National, Provincial and Regional offices for allowing me to conduct my study at their various police stations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ACRONYMS

BFI-10:   Big Five Inventory10

DIAMONDS: Duty, Intellect, Adversity, Mating, Positivity, Negativity, Deception and Sociality

NAQ-R: Negative Acts Questionnaire-Revised

OCEAN: Openness to experience Conscientiousness; Extraversion; Agreeableness, and Neuroticism

RSQ: Riverside Situational Q-Sort

SAPS: South African Police Service

SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences

WPB: Workplace Bullying

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter introduces situational and dispositional factors and workplace bullying. It also outlines the research aim, research objectives, and research hypotheses. The chapter is an overview of this study.

1.2 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Workplace bullying has gotten more attention in a various disciplines over the past years (Aquino & Thau, 2009; Gupta et al., 2020). Bullying in the workplace is gradually recognised as a complex problem to evaluate accurately and has also been known as an issue for the police service (Cowie et al., 2002; Rayner, 2000). Workplace bullying is a growing epidemic in the world of work. It affects organisations and employees negatively and hinders organisations from operating in a vibrant, successful, and moral manner (Magee et al., 2014; Salin, 2003).

Studies conducted by some authors in a South African context concluded that dealing with workplace bullying is one of the hardest things that organisations face countrywide (Cunniff & Mostert, 2012; Ncongwane, 2010; Smit, 2014). To this end, Mokgolo (2017) concluded that South Africa should be prepared to address this issue by creating guidelines and strategies to successfully manage and prevent workplace bullying. Mokgolo (2017) continues by stating that in South Africa, awareness of workplace bullying is crucial as all employees, regardless of their position, will be alerted about bullying their colleagues. The victims will know that they are being bullied and act fast. An earlier research by Vandekerckhove and Commers (2003) highlighted that bullying might be implemented in the following two forms: vertical, which is done by superiors, and lateral bullying, which happens amongst colleagues.

This study utilises Bingham (2016)'s ideas on organisational factors, including employees no longer trusting each other. Another factor added by Du Plessis (2017) is poor performance since workers are no longer motivated around completing their

tasks, Gobind (2015) detained increased levels of sickness absence because employees no longer enjoy their job and employees leaving the organisation over a set period.

The study by Watson and Kimble (2017) stated that individual factors have a deleterious psychological effect on those bullied. This study utilises Du Plessis (2017)'s ideas on individual factors which stated that it may have physical effects such as restlessness, insomnia, eating disorders, high blood pressure, and Gobind (2015)'s psychological effects which comprised of anxiety, depression, low self-esteem, trouble with relationships, post-traumatic stress (Badenhorst & Botha, 2022).

According to Jennifer et al. (2003), people who typically experience higher degrees of workplace bullying typically react negatively and exhibit more intense emotional reactions, such as helplessness, worry, fear, melancholy, and shock. Pietersen, cited in Du Plessis (2017), suggested that managers and human resource practitioners must deal with bullying because employers are responsible for their employees' safety and well-being during working hours (Gobind, 2015). A study by Namie (2017) revealed that 54% of workplace bullying stops when the perpetrator loses their job.

1.3 PROBLEM STATEMENT

Workplace bullying is progressively recognised globally as a significant organisational delinquent (Cilliers, 2012) which can, directly and indirectly, affect the effectiveness of managers and staff, as well as the financial health of the organisation (Lutgen-Sandvik & Tracy, 2012). Workplace bullying is a very serious problem which is more researched internationally than in the South African context. Research on factors influencing workplace bullying is not new in South Africa. However, situational and dispositional factors has been given slight consideration, especially in the police sector in Limpopo province, South Africa. Therefore, it is important to examine how these variables can influence workplace bullyinsg amongst police officers in a South African context.

According to Mokgolo (2017), workplace bullying is a complex matter and a mental terror, severely affecting employees' and organisations' health, dignity, relations, and well-being. An increasing number of scholars acknowledged

that other forms of workplace violence frequently result from the interaction of situational and personal factors, where the individual and the organisation exercise bi-directional effects (Dick, 2008; Farr-Wharton et al., 2017; Nielsen & Einarsen, 2018; Podsiadly & Gamian-Wilk, 2017; Samnani & Singh, 2016). Botha (2019), Gobind (2015) and Wärnich et al. (2018) outlined that organisations require guidelines to regulate the existence of bullying in the workplace so that employees/victims of bullying may feel free to report any bullying that might occur at the workplace. Prevention of bullying at workplaces, as classified by Catley et al. (2017), assists in reducing the consequences of bullying. There is not enough information about the situational and dispositional factors of bullying at the workplace in the South African context. Therefore, the current study answered whether situational and dispositional factors influence workplace bullying amongst police officers in Limpopo province, South Africa.

1.4 RESEARCH AIM AND OBJECTIVES

The research investigated the degree to which situational and dispositional factors that influence workplace bullying affect police officers.

The research objectives of this study were:
- To examine the relationship between situational factors (power imbalance, leadership and management style, demoralising organisational climate, and lack of trust) and dispositional factors (personality traits: openness to experience conscientiousness; extraversion; agreeableness, and neuroticism) on workplace bullying.
- To identify the extent to which socio-demographic factors predict workplace bullying.

1.5 RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS

The following hypotheses are to be tested:

H_1: There is a significant relationship between situational factors and workplace bullying.

H₂: There is a significant relationship between dispositional factors and workplace bullying.

H₃: Socio-demographic and situational factors will jointly and independently contribute positively and significantly to workplace bullying.

1.6 DELIMITATION OF THE STUDY

Snelson (2016) alluded that delimitation represents the scope and boundaries of a research study. The study surveyed participants from various regions, namely: Vhembe, Mopani, and Capricorn districts in the Limpopo province, and the strategies that HR managers use to decrease or avoid workplace bullying in the police stations selected. The study did not cover all the employees working at South African Police Service (SAPS), but the focus was delimited to police officers and HR staff.

1.7 OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF TERMS

The study employed and adopted the following operational terms as defined below:

1.7.1 Workplace bullying

Workplace bullying arises when a worker is repeatedly and systematically exposed to harmful behaviours that they cannot defend himself/themselves (Nielsen & Einarsen, 2018). The 22-item Negative Acts Questionnaire-Revised (NAQ-R) Einarsen et al. (2009) will measure workplace bullying.

1.7.2 Situational factors

Situational factors although they equally impact perceptions of external stimuli, refer to external or organisational factors found in the person's environment (Shropshire et al., 2015). An adapted version of Riverside Situational Q-Sort, 24-item, will measure situational factors.

1.7.3 Dispositional factors

Dispositional factors refer to distinct characteristics that comprise each individual's makeup and shape their core values, beliefs, personality traits, and attitude that

manifest behaviour (Raths, 2001). Personality traits will be measured by the Big Five Inventory-10 (BFI-10), established by Rammstedt and John (2007).

1.8 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The study sought to address the scientific gap of the situational and dispositional factors influencing workplace bullying amongst police officers. This study will contribute to current research in looking at the influence of situational and dispositional factors on workplace bullying. This study will contribute to identifying environmental and personal factors that influence bullying amongst police officers in Limpopo province and South Africa. Management of the SAPS will also benefit from this study. It will enable them to develop policies and procedures to deal with workplace bullying in general in the police sector.

1.9 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The study was conducted among police officers in the Limpopo province, South Africa. There were several ethical considerations that the researcher took throughout the different phases of the research project. Ethics is defined by Leedy and Ormrod (2012) as principles, rules, or regulations that govern behaviour and specify whether it is morally acceptable or unacceptable. The following ethical concerns were adhered to when doing this research.

Informed consent: Participation by participants was voluntary; they were informed of their rights to withdraw from the research at any given time if they felt like it. They were also informed about the purpose of the study, the importance of their participation and how the study results were to be used. No one faced any penalty or was intimidated if they decided to leave or withdrew from the study.

Confidentiality and anonymity: The researcher guaranteed confidentiality by ensuring that no information given was divulged or made available to any other person. All the information obtained was used only for research purposes, not for personal reasons. The researcher ensured that the study was not harmful to the participants and that objectivity was maintained when making a report on the data.

1.10 CHAPTER OUTLINE

Chapter 1 consists of an introduction to the study, the problem statement indicating the need for the study, and the hypothesis and objectives. The research methodology includes; the research design, measuring instruments, population and sample, sampling technique, reliability, validity, data collection and analysis of the data. Delimination of the study was discussed, operational definition of terms, the significance of the study and ethical considerations.

Chapter 2 - consists of a literature review on workplace bullying, situational and dispositional factors focusing on police officers. The theories that inform the study make up the Chapter are reviewed as well.

Chapter 3 - the study's methodology and research design are discussed. Included here are the methods used to collect data, and those use to analyse it.

Chapter 4 - analysed and interpreted data as collected from the study area. Here, the statistical results of the study were presented.

Chapter 5 - provides a discussion of the study outcomes from the literature, conclusion and future recommendations to the departments and the study.

1.11 SUMMARY OF THE CHAPTER

The background of the study was discussed in this Chapter, followed by the research problem. The research objectives, the hypotheses, the research design, measuring instruments, population and sample, sampling technique, reliability, validity, data collection and analysis of the data, elimination of the study, operational definition of terms, the significance of the study and ethical considerations were also presented in here.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides a thorough overview of workplace bullying, including dispositional and situational factors as well as previous research. The review of literature looks at studies that link dispositional and situational factors to see how they relate to workplace bullying. The theories that explain how variables interact will be discussed. Bullying will be examined from a global perspective, a continental framework, and a national and local context.

2.2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Grant and Osanloo (2014) highlighted that a theoretical framework serves as a basis or anchor for the literature appraisal and the methodologies and analysis. This study was grounded on several theoretical perspectives. Wolfgang coined Victim Precipitation Theory to characterise circumstances in which the target was the original provoker in the act that resulted their injury or damage (Petherick, 2017). This theory was used to understand the construct of workplace bullying. The Situation Construal Model aims to combine the three legs of the personality triad as alluded by Funder (2006), which include persons, situations, and behaviours. This model was used to explain the situational factors. The Five-Factor Model explains the development and functioning of personality traits such as a person's tendency to think, feel and act consistently, according to John and Srivastava (1999). This model was also used to explain the construct of dispositional factors.

For a dissertation study, Lysaght (2011) stressed the need to determine one's theoretical framework. The construction and vision are unclear excluding a theoretical framework, similar to how a home cannot be constructed with no plan.

2.2.1 Victim Precipitation Theory

According to Tepper et al. (2006), this theory argues that the victim may display specific traits or conduct and reactions that may incite or cause victimisation from others. The predisposition to blame employees for their victimisation had characterised much of the social science literature on workplace bullying. It is presumed that the perpetrator and victim frequently engage in reciprocal behaviour.

For a long time, researchers have stressed that individual personality behaviour are vital in clarifying why ill-treatment/ maltreatment occurs at the workplace (Aquino & Thau, 2009; Henle & Gross, 2014). In the criminal justice system, including workplace bullying, Bibha (2012) suggested that the Victim Precipitation Theory is given a lot of weight. As alluded by Bibha (2012), the notion also posits that the offender is passively and propelled into action primarily by the victim's actions as they are necessary and sufficient conditions for the offence to occur.

According to Petherick (2017), Victim Precipitation was coined by Wolfgang to characterise circumstances in which the target was the original aggressor in the deed that resulted in their injury or damage. Precipitation is also observed in Hentig's (1948) typology of the torturer, who causes his victimisation by abusing his family with provocative victims and explicitly with victims in Schafer's (1968) typology. Petherick (2017) stressed that researchers could learn more about the victim and offender's relationship by studying precipitation, preparing victimology or conducting a comprehensive investigation into a criminal incident such as workplace bullying.

According to a paper published by Criminal Justice (2012), the Victim Precipitation Theory states that the victim's traits trigger the criminality. A criminal may target a victim based on their sexual orientation and gender, as stated by Famolu (2015) and that criminality can happen in the form of bullying. Various authors emphasised that females appear to report somewhat more unfair treatment than males in several countries (Aquino & Bradfield, 2000; Cortina et al., 2001).

As emphasised by Elias (1986), this theory argues that people have traits that cause other people to behave badly. Criminal justice (2012) reported that someone who disagrees with them might, for example, target a political activist. Suppose a worker trusts that a newly promoted worker does not deserve the promotion. In that case,

such employees may be targeted by their coworkers, leading to the resignation of the promoted staff.

Cortina et al. (2018) stated that Victim Precipitation Theory posits that those victims of workplace abuse frequently, albeit unknowingly or otherwise, induce their victimisation. "The main assumption is that some workers who are dissatisfied, hostile, or underachieving, actively or unconsciously contribute to the chain of actions that leads to them being targets" (Aquino & Byron, 2002, p. 71). The arguments of the Victim Precipitation Theory distract attention away from offenders and the public circumstances that trigger them (Judge & Bono, 2004).

Individual personality qualities are crucial in clarifying why maltreatments or abuse happens at workplace, according to researchers who have long made this claim. (Aquino & Thau, 2009; Henle & Gross, 2014). This theory argues that the victim may display specific traits or conduct and reactions to incite or elicit victimisation from others (Tepper et al., 2006). According to Elias (1986), Victim Precipitation Theory is relevant in explaining workplace bullying and dispositional factors. According to the Victim Precipitation Theory, there are two victim archetypes, namely; the defenseless target who experiences bullying as they appear weak and the provoking target who experiences bullying since they have triggered the offender (Aquino & Lamerts, 2004; Olweus, 1978; Samnani & Singh, 2016).

Provocative behaviour is found in personality characters or might occur as a result of stressors in the work environment (Einarsen et al., 1994; Reknes et al., 2019). In addition, Watson and Clark (1984) found that those high on adverse effects tend to experience negative moods such as fury, fear,a nd sadness based on their inclination to react in specific ways. Furthermore, Spielberger (1983) emphasised that those with high trait anxiety tend to reply with unease to apparent strain in the environment with mannerism anger, sensitivity to mocking,g and undesirable appraisal by others. This theory, as suggested by Muftić and Hunt (2013 assiststt us in understanding that several targets can also be offenders, and some can also be victims.

According to the Victim Precipitation Theory, some victims instigate the conflict that leads to their victimisation, whether actively or passively. Cortina et al. (2017) recommended that workers have power over the conduct of others, which includes vehement behaviour. It further states that if vehemence arises, the target is wrong for

failing to avoid it. This model, according to Cortina et al. (2018), has numerous faults and perpetrates too much harmful behaviour.

According to various studies, people with a reckless mentality, which makes them aggressive or irritating to others, have a greater victimisation risk (Law talk report, 2021). This explanation is that impulsive persons are more likely to be targeted as they are aggressive and risky, based on the Law Talk Report (2021). They will get themselves into difficult circumstances if they're not careful. Passive precipitation transpires when a victim accidentally acts in a certain way that provokes an attack. As emphasised by Eigenberg and Garland (2003, p. 32), "The concept of Victim Precipitation provides a cultural framework which offenders can use to rationalise their behaviour".

2.2.2 Situation Construal Model

The model describes behaviour as a role of the direct effects of personality and situations as a role of construal, how people observes and reply to each job challenges (Funder, 2016). Funder (2016) avers that the situation construal model is relevant in expounding the concept of situational factors. The objbojective this model is to combine the three legs of the personality triad as alluded by Funder (2006), including individuals, situations, and behaviours. Funder (2013) postulated that a person and situation variables directly influence behaviour. These variables interact to produce one's exceptional construal of a situation, directly impacting on behaviour.

Empirical research has mostly ignored situational construal despite its long-established importance (Allport, 1931). Several groundbreaking studies have looked into specific issues. According to Morse et al. (2015), the Situational Construal Model suggests that individual and situational variables interact to determine how situations are construed and how people respond. As conditions significantly impact people's behaviour, Todd (2014) emphasised that it makes sense to figure out how people perceive situations differently and what the predictors are. The Situational Contextual Model aided the study findings in revealing the individual's conduct as a target of bullying at work.

The evaluation of issues has been well behind schedule. Even proponents of their vital importance frequently fail to identify the psychological active components that give

settings power. Instead, Funder (2009) argued that they have been made too often by subtraction, presuming that all behavioural variance not explained by a personality characteristic is due to the context. Allport (1961) gave a broader explanation that situations would be determined simply by how people interpret them, and their analysis would be absorbed back into personality research.

2.2.3 Five-Factor Model

McCrae and Costa's (2008) Five-Factor Model is primarily relevant in explaining personality traits because it is the most shared model of personality. It stipulates a expressive and comprehensive taxonomy, as Shi et al. (2009) articulated for studying individual differences. It is a model of an individual's personality divided into five traits (Grice, 2021). Personality traits are assumed sensational behavioural patterns that last for a long time. Extraversion, neuroticism, openness to experience, agreeability and conscientiousness are the five factors that make up the Five-Factor Model (Grice, 2021).

A study by Sherman et al. (2013) discovered that people with high score on agreeableness are polite, cooperative and get along with others. People high on openness managed to perceive situations as more intellectually stimulating. This means that agreeable people are well-mannered and want peace rather than antagonistic and discourteous. According to Christopher et al. (2013), neurotic individuals are prone to undergoing hostile emotions, including concern, despair and irritability, rather than being emotionally resilient. In addition, Bono and Judge (2004) described that neurotic people are insecure, sensitive, uneasy, lack self-confidence, and are defensive.

Sherman et al. (2013) provided that those who score high on conscientiousness managed to view their conditions as distinctly more appropriate to their health than those that are low on conscientiousness. The more healthy they are, the more productive they are, which improves their employee morale and job performance. Furthermore, Christopher et al. (2013) emphasised that conscientious people are task-oriented and organised. Task-oriented and organised people are the best performers

when tasked with a role as they are goal-oriented and believe that any given task has to be completed.

Extroverts are probable to engender assurance in subordinates and are confident and determined, as alluded to by Judge and Bono (2004). The authors further highlighted that when people have confidence in their colleagues, positive results are produced. This may lead to employees being productive and motivated to come to work as they are positive and have ambitions. This model explains the development and functioning of personality traits such as a person's tendency to reflect, feel and act consistently (John & Srivastava, 1999). As stated by Costa and McCrae (2013); Caprara et al. (2001), this model comprises five key personality traits: openness to experience, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism, with OCEAN as an acronym.

2.3 EMPIRICAL LITERATURE

2.3.1 Workplace bullying

Workplace bullying is defined as an array of unremitting negative behaviours aimed at an individual or group, such as making demeaning remarks, excluding or disregarding, undermining an employee's integrity, undervaluing his/her contribution, and diffusing malicious rumours (Rossiter & Sochos, 2018). It is a prolonged exposure to negative behaviours such as sabotage, criticism, and exclusion. Research conducted by Gillen et al. (2017) states that bullying in the workplace is becoming a crucial point in scholarly literature in recent years. Bond, More recently Mabasa (2021)'s study reaffirmed that, workplace bullying is a complex and widespread phenomenon, which has become a challenge to understand as an organisational phenomenon because of its complexity and numerous labels and terms that are used interchangeably by researchers, media and the public, when describing the behaviour. Tuckey and Dollard (2010), in a published work, reported that WPB is a severe and chronic workplace stressor that negatively influences individuals and organisations. The study by Roter (2011) reported that previous researchers concentrated more on bullying by colleagues and managers to subordinates.

Hunter and Bandow (2009) postulated that workers affected by violent management would frequently transfer these propensities to further areas of their lives, such as their personal and social life, as they move from one employer to another to increased areas of responsibility. Workplace bullying has a damaging effect on the individual and the organisation (Vickers, 2006). It has become widespread in organisations, as reflected in Greer and Schmelzle (2009). Workplace Bullying Survey found that 37% of U.S. workers are bullied at work. According to the Campaign Against WPB, one in five U.S. employees reported being victims of recurring workforce harassment (Namie, 2003). Besides et al. (1997) aver that parallel to abusive management, bullying occurs in all ranks of employees within the organisation comprising middle managers and top leaders.

2.3.2 Dispositional factors

Previous research by Thorns et al. (1996) has shown that the Big Five personality dimensions are related to individual and team performance in self-managed workgroups. People who are emotionally stable, assertive, sociable, and energetic, together with dependable, responsible, and achievement-oriented, perform better than others (Babcock & Wilson, 2020; Thorns et al., 1996).

Research by Kulahci et al. (2018) indicated that personality traits are significant predictors of social behaviour, determining 5 to 50% of the variance subject to the following factors: Reliability of measurement parameters of the investigated social behaviour using multi-factor, integrated assessments as well as different methods and sources of data; the validity of the methods used to measure the traits; and the presence of a logical and theoretically grounded connection of personality traits with particular social behaviours, which can then be tested empirically.

2.3.3 Situational factors

According to McFadden and Altamirano (2020), situational factors are job demands and resources that can affect how an individual responds to work responsibilities can become work overload, and, lead to unhealthy mental well-being. Keashly and Jagatic (2011) argued that power differences are a central question underlying WPB research, whether operationalised as a relative hierarchical position in the organisation, ethnicity

or race, and sometimes gender. Consequently, situational factors may perhaps surge peoples' openness to undergoing beside being causative to the way people reply to their behaviours.

Bartlett and Bartlett (2011) indicated that WPB ranges from personality traits such as narcissistic personality types and the dark triad to poor leadership in the work environment (Cowan et al., 2021; Pilch & Turska, 2014). The existing studies have mainly focused on stable personality characteristics rather than modifiable situational factors (Rai & Agarwal, 2018). Researchers Parzefall and Salin (2010) and Salin (2015) are beginning to acknowledge that bullying and harassment result from interactions between individuals and situational factors.

2.4 CONCEPTUALISATION OF BULLYING

According to the National Center Against Bullying (2021), bullying is a continuing and cautious exploitation of power in associations that involve repetitive spoken, physical, and social behaviour with the intention of triggering physical, social, or mental harm. Bullying research stretches back to the 1970s in Scandinavia, with Dan Olweus' work; by the 1990s, interest in bullying had extended to Europe, Canada, and the United States (Fisher, 2015). Relational bullying was legally acknowledged in the 1990s while cyberbullying emerged in the 2000s due to recent technological advancements (Smith & Monks, 2006).

"Bullying is aggressive; intentional behaviours carried out frequently and over time by a group or an individual against a victim who cannot easily defend themselves" (Olweus, 1993, p.140). It can involve an individual or a group mistreating their power over one or more others who cannot stop it. In addition, the National Center Against Bullying (2021) highlights that bullying can also happen in person or online on several digital platforms and devices. It can be overt or covert behaviour that can be repeated for a very long time, as long as the victim and the perpetrator are not aware that their actions are bullying another person.

According to Monks and Smith (2006), bullying includes verbal attacks such as name-calling, threats, physical acts, and relational/social aggressiveness. Farrington (1993) agreed that bullying contains the aim of injuring a power imbalance amongst the

perpetrator and the target, which frequently transpires as the perpetrator gains control while the target loses control of power due to fear of losing their jobs.

According to Richard et al. (2012), "bullying behaviour can be overt (such as physical or verbal aggression) or covert (such as urging other children to ignore a particular classmate)" (p.270). Fisher (2015) stated that traditional bullying, which includes all forms of bullying except cyberbullying, is usually limited to school grounds and ends when the victim leaves; cyberbullying is neither outwardly physical nor verbal in contrast to traditional bullying. Because workplace bullying undermines the fundamental right to human dignity, which is one of its harmful effects, it is constitutional to defend employees' dignity at work (Republic of South Africa, 1996; Smit, 2014). Ndegwa and Moronge (2016) assert that one of the utmost significant areas of concern in human resource management is workplace performance. Ndegwa and Moronge (2016) highlight that working conditions and psychosocial surroundings are equally significant in shaping individual and organisational performance based on this notion. Workplace bullying has become a challenge that is very expensive to disregard, and it is a severe issue in Kenya that is inflicting significant harm to individuals and trganisation (Ndegwa & Moronge, 2016). Workplace bullying has a damaging consequences on the individual and the organisation (Vickers, 2006).

2.4.1 Types of Workplace Bullying

Chappell and Di Martino (2006) emphasised that bullying activities may include making life hard for individuals having the latent to be best at the perpetrator's work than the perpetrator himself and grueling others for being excessively competent through frequent criticism. Scared of loosing job, to be humiliated in public, not sharing information with those concerned, and shouting are all instances of harassment behaviour. Lewis (2002) emphasises that bullying may be hidden or overt and violent in a spoken or nonverbal fashion. Einarsen (1999) asserted that bullying conduct may be classified according to five groups: Bullying at work, which may include alterations to the work environment to make duties more challenging to complete. Isolation from others, individual assaults, or attacks on victims' life which is private, being screamed at in front of others, physical bullying, or fears of physical harm (Zapf, 1999).

2.4.1.1 Direct overt bullying

"Direct overt bullying includes verbal abuse such as disparaging remarks, public humiliation, criticism, incorrect charges, and intimidation" (Cunniff & Mostert, 2012, p.10). Direct overt bullying as described by Crothers et al. (2009), refers to situations such as defamation, hazing or attacked physically. Excessive mocking, telling lies or rumours, throwing repeated condemnation, joking practically, and participating in coercion are all instances of individual-associated bullying, according to (Catherine-Scheeler et al., 2021; Einarsen et al., 2009). The victim is directly targeted negatively and personally using abusive language, leading to poor job performance and employee turnover.

2.4.1.2 Indirect covert bullying

According to Einarsen et al. (2009), indirect or covert bullying is an extra elusive form of bullying that seeks to influence associations and injure individuals emotionally. Covert indirect bullying as explained by Crothers et al. (2009), refers to a non cooperating situation with an individual while it is a prerequisite of the work to do so. Catherine-Scheeler et al. (2021) indicated that covert bullying includes acts such as spreading rumours, excluding targets from societal meetings, failing to tell workers of choices that may directly affect them, deploying information that targets get, and abandoning the victims' employed circumstances.

2.4.1.3 Sporadic/once-off bullying

According to Chappell and Di Martino (2009), bullying is defined as a mounting method in which unpleasant encounters must occur routinely and persistently, such as once a week over six months (2009). This form of behaviour does constitute multiple actions as several employees are usually present when one-time acts transpire. Chappell and Di Martino (2009) further avow that a "conflict" cannot be labelled bullying if the episode is secluded or if both parties of equivalent power are at odds.

2.4.1.4 Serious bullying

Roland and Munthe (2017) highlighted that severe bullying implies bullying or being bullied once a week or more often. As described by Einarsen et al. (2009), bullying in these situations frequently consists of continual negative acts such as constant harsh remarks, isolation from the group, or gossiping and disseminating false information.

2.4.1.5 Individual bullying

Individual bullying refers to a situation whereby a worker/colleague continues to threaten, demean, embarrass or demoralise an employee (Linton & Power, 2013; van der Westhuizen, 2021). Bullies frequently target individuals, and subtle psychological threats can readily be disguised as initiation ceremonies or presented as humour. Emotional blackmail, according to Von Bergen et al. (2006), is similar to manipulation and most liable just one more type of bullying. Einarsen et al. (2009) also mention dispute-related bullying, in which a fight causes bullying, emphasising that the border between interpersonal conflict and bullying can be blurry.

2.4.1.6 Group bullying

Safety & Health Assessment and Research for Prevention (2011) referred to group bullying as a group of workers/colleagues who continue to threaten, demean, embarrass or demoralise an employee(s). The conceptual distinction between mobbing and bullying has directed to integration due to what appear to be comparable detrimental impacts on those who are affected by these phrases.

2.4.2 Workplace Bullying and Global Perceptive Experience

Workplace bullying can be defined as acts or spoken words that can damage mentality or isolate an individual at work, including intimidating and humiliating others (Nielsen & Einarsen, 2018). Rossiter and Sochos (2018) also define bullying at work as an array of ongoing negative behaviours intended at a person or a group, such as making insulting comments, discounting or ignoring, undermining the integrity of a worker, underestimating their contribution, and diluting malicious rumours. It has also been described as the aggressive assertion of dominance. The term "workplace bullying",

as described by Einarsen et al. (2020) and Leymann (1996), has traditionally been used to describe "repeated, negative activities that denigrate, humiliate, isolate, or even result in the removal of a person from the workplace."

A study published in 2007 stated that workplace bullying and unfairness account for about two million organisational members quitting their positions alone each year, costing American businesses over $64 billion. Bullying at work may cause a loss of output and trustworthiness among workers, as well as lead to lawsuits (Smit, 2014). A study conducted by Drabek et al. (2010) alluded to no single, agreed-upon definition of workplace violence or harassment. Chappell and Di Martino (1999) highlighted that violence is a broad phrase that encompasses all forms of abuse, including humiliating conduct, demeans, or diminishes a individual's worth, dignity, or well-being. According to the International Labour Organisation (2015), workplace violence can take various forms, including non-physical or psychological violence.

Workplace bullying is defined by the World Health Organisation (WHO) as the deliberate use of physiological power or violence in contradiction of oneself, another individual, or a group that is highly likely to lead to harm, including physical harm, mental harm, and wrong growth or starvation (Podsiadly & Gamian-Wilk, 2017). Gender appears to be the most commonly studied socio-demographic characteristic, according to research undertaken by Björkqvist et al. (1994). Some authors claim that women and younger employees were subjected to more significant bullying than older employees (Einarsen & Skogstad, 1996; Hoel & Cooper, 2000; Leymann, 1996; Vartia, 1996). A study by Rayner (1997) found that bullying victims were typically less than 25 years old. Meanwhile, Einarsen and Skogstad's (1996) reported that senior workers experienced the ultimate prevalence of bullying. Similarly, other Scandinavian researchers have revealed that older employees are more likely to be exposed to aggressive deeds (Einarsen et al., 1994).

Workplace bullying harms both the manager and the worker. When the employee's performance is poor, the manager will suffer as there is a level of expectation based on the performance contract. In terms of bullying and the target's employment condition, Baron and Neumann (1996) identified a link between bullying and the usage of part-time employees, whereas Hoel and Cooper (2000) discovered that permanent workers were more vulnerable than individuals who are part-timers. Kivimäki et al.

(2000), on the other hand, observed no variances in the incidence of bullying amongst workers who are not permanently employed and individuals who are permanently employed. In terms of the victims' organisational standing, Hoel et al. (2001) have found that the amounts of bullying targets for workers and those in senior or top management posts, are similar.

Einarsen and Raknes (1997), for example, revealed that workers and supervisors or managers both experienced negative behaviour in identical amounts. Hunter and Bandow (2009) postulated that workers affected by violent management would frequently transfer these propensities to further areas of their personal and social lives, as they move from one employer to another. The authors emphasised that those affected will also transfer these tendencies to increased areas of responsibility as bullying is associated with hierarchical standing whereby employees at the lower level are reporting more bullying than those at the higher level.

2.4.2 Global Perspective of Bullying

The United States tackles bullying as a type of harassment according to Harthill (2011) if it is executed according to one of the protected, undisputable traits which includes race, sex, national origin, religion, disability and age. A study published in 2007 stated that workplace bullying and unfairness account for about two million organisational members quitting their positions alone each year, costing American businesses over $64 billion. Workplace bullying may cause a loss of production and trustworthiness among workers, as well as lead to lawsuits (Smit, 2014).

The United Kingdom treats bullying, although with limited success, as a kind of harassment based on their Protection from Harassment Act 1997. Nonetheless, a slight measure comparative study of workers in the United Kingdom and Portugal found numerous substantial variances (Cowie et al., 2000), including a significantly higher occurrence of bullying in Portugal than in the United Kingdom and variances in bullying risk groups and perpetrator profiles.

Australia reports bullying on the occupational health and safety field according to Work Australia Bullying (2019) article. The state of Victoria in Australia enacted a new workplace homicide law as emphasised by Windholz (2020), whereby the employer

smay be held accountable if there is criminal negligence or a person commits suicide due to ongoing victimisation and harassment at work.

Sweden: A study by Proskauer (2013) and Vega and Comer (2005) indicates that Sweden was the first country to establish anti-bullying laws when they endorsed the Ordinance on Victimisation at Work in 1993. Sweden is frequently considered as the pioneer in preventing workplace bullying, according to Vega and Comer (2005). This ordinance contains provisions that forbid workplace bullying, end reprisals against staff members who report bullying, pay compensation to victims, and fine bullies and employers that tolerate bullying (Gibson, 2016). The Swedish government created the Occupational Health and Safety Act (OHS) which was a regulatory body that carried out laws and offered workplace inspections, as observed by Velázquez and Jain (2021). Social Modernisation Act 2002 found that Sweden and France established particular regulation to combat bullying, France is the only country where it is a crime.

Finland: Salmivalli et al. (2011) highlighted that in Finland, it was discovered that one-sixth of respondents had been victimised at work by colleagues and that females were more victimised than males were targets of bullying. Salin (2001) discovered that women reported being victimised more often than men in numerous nations. There is a belief that women have less authority and prestige than men, explaining the higher victimisation rate. This is corroborated by a study conducted in Tehran, Iran, by Gholipour et al. (2001), which found that women were bullied far in comparison to their male counterparts. Given the country's past, it's no surprise that a study by Saberi (2019) discovered that female workers are unaware of their rights at work.

Spain: The issue of workplace bullying has gotten more consideration in Spain, according to Moreno-Jiménes and Muños (2006), and has recently culminated in a special edition on workplace bullying.

2.4.3 Bullying in Africa

Finchilescu et al. (2019) researched *the impact of workplace bullying in the Zimbabwean nursing environment*. They found that nurses working at hospitals in Southern Africa have specific problems, which might foster an environment conducive to bullying. Doctors, equipment and basic supplies are in low supply in public hospitals, and hospitals are severely understaffed (Finchilescu et al., 2019). Furthermore, the

study found that work satisfaction and the likelihood of leaving were highly influenced by the level of bullying experienced by the nurses, but this was not reduced by social support. Adewumi and Danesi (2017) avow that literature on Exploring and Investigating Workplace Bullying in Nigeria concluded that bullying behaviours in the Nigerian workplace may be handled by enlisting the active participation of all stakeholders in preventing and reacting to it. In Zambia, Former first Lady Esther Lungu adopted solid workplace regulations to eliminate all forms of gender-based violence, notably sexual harassment, from workplaces (Staff, 2017). Furthermore, women in Zambia are susceptible to various forms of violence and unjust treatment at work. Females endure to be the target of unfair labour practices, discrimination, and abuse across the board, including employee involvement, training, performance reviews and awards (Staff, 2017).

According to Baseline Report (2018), ongoing media reports indicate a persistent crisis and increasing worry about the effects of sexual harassment in the nation's workplaces. Swaziland's Extended National Multisectoral HIV and AIDS Framework (eNSF) (2014-2018) mentions explicitly sexual gender-based violence (SGBV) as an example of the country's leading causes of new HIV infections. In general, the survey indicates that reporting sexual harassment by employees is extremely low; less than 20% (18.3 per cent) in the private area and a paltry 5.6 per cent in NGOs (Baseline Report, 2018). The study by Tag-Eldeen, Barakat and Dar (2017) investigated the influence of bullying at work and found an association that workplace bullying hurt employee turnover intentions. In addition, the study's findings revealed that those working in the hospitality business are particularly vulnerable to bullying, as stated by Tag-Eldeen et al. (2017). Employee job security, prospective career advancement, and a healthy working environment are negatively impacted according to Tag-Eldeen et al. (2017). The assigned tasks of bullied employees will not be completed correctly, which will lead them not to engage in role behaviours that impact their competitive benefit.

2.4.4 Bullying in South Africa

In South Africa, workplace bullying was first made widely known by Susan Marais Steinman in July 1994, an inventor in the industry for spotting it across a variety of

occupational sectors in 1998, and the health sector in 2003. Despite the fact that section 36(1) of The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa 1996 stipulates that everyone has the right to dignity and fair labor p although bullying is not recognised as a cause of action in South African law. Furthermore, section 6(1) of the Employment Equity Act (EEA) also forbids unjust acumen based on arbitrary reasons, as well as grounds that are specified and unlisted.

However, bullying is never specifically addressed anywhere, and even the courts are unwilling to recognize it as a legal basis for action. Section 5(1) of the Occupational Health and Safety Act (OHSA) states that every employer shall offer and maintain a workplace that is safe and free from risks to the health of employees to the extent that such provision is practically practicable.

Cunniff and Mostert (2012) researched the *prevalence of Workplace Bully among South African employees.* When compared to employees from minority groups including Colored, White, and Indian employees, the survey indicated that Black workers in South Africa, the country's majority ethnic group, faced the maximum level of bullying at work. The scholars discovered significant differences between all the socio-demographic groups. Cunniff and Mostert (2012) emphasised that few studies looked at the disparities in socio-demographic groups' experiences with bullying at work, which is essential as the South African workforce comprises multicultural and multiracial people.

Bernstein and Trimm (2016) researched *the impact of workplace bullying on individual well-being.* They found that bullying at the workplace has a direct detrimental effect on one's mental health, self-esteem, job satisfaction, and intention to leave. Avoidance and doing nothing also increased the detrimental effects of bullying on psychological well-being while counterintuitively moderating the link between bullying and psychological well-being. A study by Dehue et al. (2012) noted these illogical results for avoiding action and doing nothing.

Mokgolo (2017) researched *workplace bullying: from a human resource practitioner perspective.* The study discovered that the HR practitioner's duty to promote and advance the interests of the targeted in situations when bullying might occur is conflicted with the duty to the management and commercial goals. It ought to add to

the scant body of information on HR professionals' thoughts on bullying at work in the South African setting.

Conco et al. (2021) researched *experiences of workplace bullying among academics in a health sciences faculty at a South African university.* The study's findings that female participants were more likely to experience workplace harassment are consistent with other studies by Rouse et al. (2016), researchers discovered that more female family doctors than their male counterparts reported experiencing bullying. According these findings, academic standing and hierarchy are the main causes of bullying in the Faculty of Health Sciences.

Bullying at work in the South African work environment is a disputed phenomenon that is expensive for both individuals and organisations and hurts both personal and professional life as well as work performance, employee and organisational wellness, and workplace relations (Cilliers, 2012; De Wet & Jacobs, 2013; Smit,2014). Research done by Work Dignity Institute in 2000 revealed that roughly 77.8% of South Africans had experienced bullying at work.

Steinman (2003) stated that bullying was a part of the larger violence problematic in South Africa as early as 2003, operating as a basis of conflict in the workplace, albeit often originating from the outside world. South Africa has a shady image for having one of the world's maximum rates of violent criminality, as Nelen and Siegel (2021) revealed, which explains the amount of information presented to the reader about the severity of the situation. The lack of organisational and national regulations against workplace bullying is bad because it gives the appearance that bullying is acceptable, which encourages bullying (Smit, 2014).

According to Workman-Davies (2020), the path to a resolution is frequently not apparent regarding workplace bullying. Staff et al. (2012) further highlighted that an employee was fired for medical incapacity even though the employer had used this as a convenient on removing her after she filed a complaint about the bullying. A study by Visagie et al. (2012) used the NAQ to measure bullying in a South African mining business and discovered that 27,7% of workers stated being bullied in the six months before the study (Visagie et al., 2012). Cunniff and Mostert (2012) revealed that one out of every ten employees reported being victims of workplace bullying, and 46.5% of employees witnessed bullying. Research done by Work Dignity Institute in 2000

University of Venda

found that roughly 77.8% of South Africans had undergone bullying at workplace. Cunniff and Mostert (2012) emphasised that few studies looked at the disparities in socio-demographic groups' experiences with workplace bullying, which is essential as the South African workforce comprises multicultural and multiracial people.

Steinman (2003) revealed that workplace bullying had reached abnormal proportions. An online communication survey was done between 1998 and 1999, and the response rate revealed that 78% of the respondents had been bullied at least once during their careers (Steinman, 2003). Steinman (2003) stated that bullying was a part of the larger violence problem in South Africa as early as 2003, functioning as a basis of conflict in the workplace, albeit often originating from the outside world. South Africa has a shady image for having one of the world's highest rates of violent crime, as Nelen and Siegel (2021) revealed, which explains the amount of information presented to the reader about the severity of the situation.

2.4.5 South Africa Labour Law on Bullying

According to Workman-Davies (2020), since the Labour Relations Act was initially enacted in 1995, South African labour law has acquired a rich body of case law. Most employees are fully aware of their rights not to be unlawfully fired or subjected to unethical labour practices. Currently, no legislation in South Africa clearly defines or includes workplace bullying. The part of the Employment Equity Act 55 of 1998 that comes closest to encapsulating this concept is Section (6), which states:

(1) *"*In any employment policy or practise, no one may unfairly discriminate against an employee on one or more grounds, such as race, gender, sex, pregnancy, marital status, family responsibility, ethnic or social origin, colour, sexual orientation, age, disability, religion, HIV status, conscience, belief, political opinion, culture, language, or birth" (Harassment Info Sheet CCMA, 2018).

(2)   It is not unfair discrimination to –

(a)   Take affirmative action measures consistent with the purpose of this Act.

(b)   Distinguish, exclude or prefer any person based on an inherent job requirement (Harassment Info Sheet CCMA, 2018).

(3)   Employee harassment is a kind of unfair discrimination that is prohibited on any one or a combination of the grounds of unfair discrimination stated in subsection." It is clear from these clauses that "workplace bullying" is included in the definition of "harassment." The CCMA created "information sheets" that state that "harassment" in the workplace includes:

"Bullying; Spreading malicious rumours; Insulting others; Degrading, or picking on, another; Exclusion or victimisation; Unfair treatment; Unwelcome sexual advances and gestures; Making unsubstantiated threats about job security; Undermining a competent worker through overloading or constant criticism, or intentionally blocking promotion or training opportunities" (Harassment Info Sheet CCMA, 2018).

2.5 CONCEPTUALISATION OF DISPOSITIONAL FACTORS

According to research conducted over two decades, workplace bullying has been identified as a standard and harmful stressor in most modern workplaces, with precursors and risk factors at multiple levels of analysis. Workplace bullying is characterised as an worker's repeated experience to undesired actions from one or more co-workers, with the target having difficulty defending themselves (Olweus, 1991). While the causes of bullying are complex and challenging to pinpoint, the "Individual Disposition Hypothesis" and the "Work Environment Hypothesis" are the two most widely held opinions on how bullying occurs (Salin & Hoel, 2011). Previous research by Thoms et al. (1996) has shown that the Big Five personality dimensions are connected to both individual and team performance, in self-managed workgroups. Emotional maturity, self-advocacy, sociability, and vigor, together with reliable, accountable, and achievement-oriented, perform better than others (Thoms et al., 1996).

Individual qualities, such as personality traits, are emphasised as possible early signs of bullying in the "Individual Disposition Hypothesis," which asserts that specific features, or combinations of traits, enhance the likelihood of being a target or perpetrator of bullying (Nielsen & Knardahl, 2015). Research by Kulahci, Ghasanfar and Rubenstein (2018) indicated that personality traits are significant predictors of social behaviour. A study by Baillien et al. (2009), "Work Environment Hypothesis",

claims that unfavourable and poorly arranged work settings increase bullying by causing distress and conflicts among employees.

Individuals' responses to environmental stimuli and how they cope with them, as emphasised by Lazarus and Folkman (1984), are influenced by personal factors. Francioli et al. (2016) added that as a result, personal dispositions might impact how workers perceive and interact with their psychosocial work setting and the repercussions of this experience. In this context, "dispositional affect", as highlighted by Tharp et al. (2020) who refer to a broad range of additional or fewer stable affecting traits and inclinations, as evaluated by trait anxiety and trait rage as well as both adverse and favorable effects.

Nielsen et al. (2017) revealed that indicators had been demonstrated to be the best-established individual risk aspects for workplace bullying. According to Elias (1986), personal characteristics that make you susceptible and weak, or provocative and aggressive can provoke hostility in others, making the aim the main subject. In addition, Salin (2003) concluded that one eye-catching, yet alarming aspect of workplace bullying, is thought to be an efficient method for enhancing staff performance in some firms. It can be portrayed as a struggle for distinction without regard for the costs, leading to workplace bullying being tolerated.

Regarding dispositional factors' moderating effect, Weiss and Kurek (2003) stated that people who experience pleasant emotions have more favorable occurrences or a rosier sense of realism than those who do not. People with negative affect and feelings tend to perceive things more pessimistically or depressingly. The study hypothesised that positive affect might serve as a shield in situations of confrontation and bullying. In contrast, negative affects serve as vulnerability and enhancement factors, as do trait rage and trait anxiety, as Weiss and Kurek (2003) emphasised, respectively.

2.5.1 The five factors of personality

2.5.1.1 Extraversion

Extraversion is the propensity and fervor with which a person desires communication with their environment, especially socially. It takes into account people's comfort levels

and aggressiveness in social situations. John and Srivastava (1999) assert that extraversion also indicates the energy sources used by the subject. Lim (2020) observed that extroverted people gain energy, get excited, and express themselves by being amongst people; that's why they receive high scores because they are jolly and enjoy the excitement as they find it easy to participate.

2.5.1.2 Agreeableness

Agreeableness is concerned with how people interact with others and their attitudes (Ackerman, 2017). It designates how people consider interpersonal relationships agreeableness. Soft-hearted, trusting and well-liked people have a high agreeableness score (Jensen-Campbell & Graziano, 2001). The general public view them as reliable and generous. A study found that those scoring high in agreeableness are unlikely to be harsh or rude and come across as very well-mannered (van der Westhuizen, 2021).

2.5.1.3 Neuroticism

Neuroticism as emphasized by Judge and Bono (2004) describes an individual's overall emotional stability and predisposition towards negative feelings as it takes into account an individual's inclination to view situations as terrifying or challenging. "Anxiety, insecurity and self-pity are common feelings among those with high neuroticism scores" (Lim, 2020). In addition, van der Westhuizen (2021) detected that individuals scoring high in neuroticism reveal a superior amount of strain and unease, encounter negative feelings in response to their environment as they are irritable, moody, have low self-esteem.

2.5.1.4 Openness to experience

Openness to experience is the willingness to experiment and take part in creative and intellectual pursuits. It involves having the capacity to think creatively. Those with a high receptivity experience are perceived as being more artistic and creative according to Lim (2020) as a study by van der Westhuizen (2021) discovered that people who score highly on openness tend to dislike routine experiences. Those scoring high on

this trait become non-traditional because of a broad diversity of activities and preclude predictable stances (Munir et al., 2021).

2.5.1.5 Conscientiousness

Grohol (2019) defines conscientiousness as an individual's ability to control their instincts and participate in goal-oriented conduct, well-organised, disciplined, thoughtful, cautious and meet objectives. Individuals with low conscientiousness scores may find it challenging to complete tasks and meet goals. In addition, van der Westhuizen (2021) observed that conscientious individuals have self-control and are when preparing for and completing tasks. Persons scoring high in conscientiousness are very productive, prepared and dependable, and are always responsible.

2.6 CONCEPTUALISATION OF SITUATIONAL FACTORS

"Situational factors are job demands and resources that can affect how an individual responds to work responsibilities that can become work overload and lead to unhealthy mental well-being" (McFadden & Altamirano, 2020, p.45). Keashly and Jagatic (2011) suggested that the key issue underpinning power disparities WPB research, whether operationalised as a relative hierarchical status, racial or ethnic identity, or occasionally gender. One of the biggest predictors of workplace aggressiveness has been discovered to be "situational restrictions", according to Bowling and Beehr (2006). Stressful work situations appear to generate conditions that encourage bullying at work (De Cuyper et al., 2009). According to a study by Baillien et al. (2011), job insecurity and role stresses as limited job autonomy and being both the bully and the victim of bullying at work has been connected to having a demanding workload..

Boredom also predicts workplace violence, according to Bruursema et al. (2011), implying that managers should balance workloads such that staff are busy enough to avoid issues but not overworked to the point that they become reactive out of stress. Researchers such as Parsefall and Salin (2010) and Salin (2015) are starting to understand that interactions between people and environmental elements lead to bullying and harassment. Bartlett and Bartlett (2011) indicated that workplace bullying

ranges from personality traits such as narcissism and the dark triad to poor leadership in the workplace (Pilch & Turska, 2015). The study by Rai and Agarwal (2018), primarily concentrated on immovable psychological traits as opposed to changeable environmental conditions. Leadership style is another significant situational aspect that has arisen.

As stated by Hepworth and Towler (2004), those who engage in workplace bullying frequently report having fewer charismatic leaders. As alluded by Hauge et al. (2007), bullying perceptions have also been linked to noncontingent punishment authoritarian and laisses-faire leadership styles. Supervisors who adopt these leadership styles may venture an attitude that appears acceptable toward bullying at work. Hershcovis et al. (2007) concluded that meta-analytic research indicates that workplace injustice significantly predicts aggressive behaviour at work. Workplace bullying is regard as a severe kind of social stress. It is portrayed as a problem that is more disabling and horrible to workers than all other work-related pressures collective (Matthiesen & Einarsen, 2004). Coping strategies are described as person-specific and have varying effects on the victim during the bullying process, dependent on social standards, and having coping mechanisms that victims likely use is very important in a bullying environment (Cox, 1978).

2.7 EFFECTS OF PERSONALITY ON BULLYING

Personality is a crucial component in separating the victims from the non-victims at work (Coyne et al., 2000). A study done by Olweus in 1978 found that bullying is a consistent personality attribute. Personality traits proved to be helpful for analysing bullies' personality and assessing bullying behaviour. The Big Five personality traits comprise of (1) extroversion and introversion, referring to a personality that depends on building associations with other people; (2) agreeableness, having a pleasing personality; (3) conscientiousness, a reliable personality; (4) Neuroticism and emotional stability, a personality that makes it possible to handle any stress; and (5) openness, a personality that appreciates the variety of experiences (Leephaijaroen, 2016).

van der Westhuizen (2021) suggested that people with particular personality qualities intentionally or unintentionally go against norms of the workplace and expectations, infuriating those that share the workplace with them. Bernstein and Trimm (2016) suggested that "when individuals who have the potential to clash in terms of personality traits are not expected to work too closely with one another may be another avenue to limit bullying at the workplace" (p.9). "Victim's negative emotionality, self-esteem and neuroticism may predict victimisation as employees who fall victim to workplace bullying display high neuroticism, low agreeableness and extraversion, and high conscientiousness" (Podsiadly & Gamian-Wilk, 2017, p.46).

Research by Nielsen and Knardahl (2015) explored the psychological factors that contribute to bullying. They discovered that neuroticism predicted future bullying when investigating the direct association amongst personality traits and targets of bullying, (Nielsen & Knardahl, 2015). Glasø et al. (2007), and Podsiadly and Gamian-Wilk (2017) revealed that personality features might be used to identify who is most likely to be the target of bullying and risk factors for becoming a target of bullying. Research by Aquino and Lamerts (2004) has shown that perpetrators of victimisation will target submissive people as they rarely retaliate than proactive ones to reduce the risk of being opposed and counterattacked. People who have experienced bullying typically cooperate and submit to stay away from hostility or conflict (Salin, 2008).

According to Namie and Namie (2009), Bullying targets cooperate and submit to avoid conflict, and they may even blame themselves for their perpetrator's behaviour. Tepper et al. (2006) assert that aggressive people with similar tough characteristics are more likely to be bullied, and they struggle to predict the consequences of their actions. Einarsen et al. (1994) and Zapf (1999) revealed that victims of workplace bullying frequently lack the coping skills and self-confidence to deal with the situation, such as being introverted, having low self-esteem, and lacking conflict resolution abilities. A recent study by Ahmad et al. (2021) revealed that some individual traits are provocative due to possible shortcomings include a lack of social abilities and inability to cope with aggressive behaviours.

2.8 BULLYING IN POLICE SECTOR

Workplace bullying can have a bad effect on productivity, which may have an impact on the level of service that law enforcement agencies offer to the public. "Bullying does exist in policing in Australia and that senior management may have established performance indicators that are too difficult for police officers to meet" (Farr-Wharton et al., 2017, p.330). It is possible for managers to intimidate police officers in order to meet their own performance goals. Research by Parzefall and Salin (2010) found that organisational elements like the nature of workplace interactions could either enable or hinder bullying, while Salin (2003) suggested that encouraging structures and procedures that prevent or promote bullying are provided by supervisors.

Police officers have a high risk work relative to many other professions, and their operational responsibilities expose them to a variety of physical and psychological risks (Mayhew, 2001). Previous researchers expressed that allowing extreme supervision of work and improperly high workloads are identified as some adverse consequences for police officers, possibly from the latest public sector reforms (Adcroft & Willis, 2005; Brunetto et al., 2011; Brunetto et al., 2012; Farr-Wharton et al., 2017). "All employees have a right to a working environment that is free from discrimination, harassment and bullying" according to chapter 2, section 24 Bill of Rights, while there is currently no clear and thorough legal pathway for the settlement of workplace bullying allegations for targets, (Queensland Workplace Bullying Taskforce, 2001).

Police departments, like any organisations, could be the target of such accusations. According to Namie and Namie (2000) and Mayhew (2001), police organisations stand to gain by making sure that police grievance procedures have suitable methods for resolving complaints and limiting the possibility that bullying situations will evolve into issues that need to be handled through external legal processes and workers' compensation claims. Brown and Campbell (1994) alluded that workplace bullying can potentially have more serious effects for police organisations than for other organisations do due to the nature of their work. The costs involved in the recruitment process of police officers are very high, which means that bullying must be condemned and addressed where it is detected.

2.9 SUMMARY

This section gives a detailed background of workplace bullying, dispositional and situational factors, and previous research. The theories related to this study were outlined in this chapter, the theory of Victim Precipitation, Situation Construal Model, and Five-Factor Model, which explain the relationship between workplace bullying, dispositional and situational factors. Various forms of bullying, personality traits, global perspective and South African Labour Law on bullying were discussed in this chapter.

University of Venda

3.1 INTRODUCTION

Chapter Two presented a detailed background of workplace bullying, dispositional and situational factors, and previous research. It outlined the theories related to this study which explained the relationship between workplace bullying, dispositional and situational factors. Various forms of bullying, personality traits, global perspective and South African Labour Law on bullying were also discussed in chapter Two. Chapter Three provides a detailed outline of the methodology used in this study. It comprises of research paradigm, research design, population and sampling techniques, sampling, data collection methods, research approach and procedures, pilot study, data analysis, ethical consideration as well as delimination of the study.

3.2 RESEARCH PARADIGM

The positivist philosophical paradigm was employed in this study. Aliyu et al. (2014) assert that positivism is viewed as a study strategy and technique founded on the ontological tenet that reality and truth are independent of the observer and spectator. This philosophy employs Rene Descartes's epistemology, which includes hypothesis and theory of knowledge reasoning. The author believes that using reason is the best way to produce knowledge and information about reality and truth (Descartes, 2008). Positivists usually select scientific methods to produce knowledge. According to Rahi (2017), Supporters of this paradigm believe that observation and experimentation are the only ways to truly learn anything.

3.3 RESEARCH DESIGN

"Research design is a blueprint for a study that offers an overall plan for data collection, analysis, and measurement" (Bryman, 2012; Sekaran & Bougie, 2016). By putting the research strategy into practice, it offers an operational framework that responds to the research questions. A research design serves as a pillar of the whole research because it gives phases and guidelines to be considered throughout the study. A survey was used to obtain the data for this study. According to Bless et al. (2013),

when using a survey, data can be gathered utilising telephone interviews, in-person interviews, or even questionnaires. For this study, data was obtained using questionnaires. It was highlighted by Bless et al. (2013) that the use of questionnaires allow the researcher to obtain data from a large pool of respondents, fast and efficiently.

The study employed a quantitative approach because it is primarily suitable when looking into relationships between factors (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). "Moreover, in a quantitative study, the researcher focuses on numerical methods and emphasises on calculating occurrences, quantities or size of associations between entities" (Gelo et al., 2006, p.270). Quantitative approach summarises data from the respondents into statistical representations rather than textual pictures of the phenomenon. Bryman and Bell (2011) stressed Quantitative research is very useful when examining relationships between variables, describing variables and determining the interactions between variables. A quantitative research approach was selected to investigate the relationship between workplace bullying, situational and dispositional factors.

3.4 STUDY POPULATION

Creswell and Poth (2016) define population as the total number of the whole elements in the area that is under study. The target population was made up of 450 SAPS employees even though only categories of police officers and HR personnel working at the selected police stations were chosen. The population consisted of workers at the lower, middle and higher-level positions in different police stations. A sample, according to Bryman and Bell (2011) is a group of elements drawn from the population, which is representative of the population and is studied to obtain knowledge about the population. Bless et al. (2013) also referred a sample to a subset of the whole population whose individualities will formerly be generalised to the population.

3.5 SAMPLING

Sampling is defined as a procedure to select a sample from individual or from a large group of population for certain kind of research purpose (Bhardwaj, 2019). The sample of the study was selected using multisampling techniques. First, a purposive sampling method was used to choose the police stations. Purposive sampling method, also

referred to as a judgmental or expert sample, is defined by Battaglia (2008) as a sort of nonprobability sampling with the main aim of producing a sample that can be rationally presumed to be representative of the population. Initially, a total of 270 questionnaires together with **Google Drive Forms**[TM] link were distributed to the participants in different police stations as the study was done electronically and physically. Of the 242 returned questionnaires, 111 were done online while 131 were done physically to give a response rate of 90%. However, from the 242 questionnaires, the scholar noticed that in some questionnaires, there was some missing information, and only 208 questionnaires were usable. Sample size was determined using Raosoft sample size calculator whereby a sample size of 149 participants was drawn as follows:

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)2}$$

$$n = \frac{242}{1 + 242(0.05)2}$$

$$n=149$$

3.6 DATA COLLECTION

To gather information from the sample, a questionnaire which comprised of four sections was used. The first section consisted of demographic information; section B focused on workplace bullying, section C on dispositional factors while section D focused on situational factors.

Biographical Information: To obtain biographical information, a self-designed biographical questionnaire was used. The biographical questionnaire gathered data concerning the demographical variables such as gender, age, race, educational qualifications, years of service, position and type of appointment.

22-item Negative Acts Questionnaire-Revised (NAQ-R): was used to measure workplace bullying (Einarsen et al., 2009). It is a five-point Likert scale with 22-items and the response scale ranging from 1 to 5: 1 = daily, 2 = weekly, 3 = monthly, 4 = occasionally, 5 = never. Some of the items included in this instrument are, "Someone withholding information which affects your performance, being humiliated or ridiculed about your work and spreading of gossip and rumors about you". Previous study

reported the Cronbach alpha coefficient for the scale of 0.91 (Rosander & Blomberg, 2018). This scale had a reliability coefficient of Cronbach's alpha 0.97 in this study.

Big Five Inventory-10 (BFI-10): This was established by Rammstedt and John (2007) for analysing the five factors which comprises of 10 items. The questionnaire was utilised to measure personality traits. Each factor is made of two item statements. The items are rated on a 5- point Likert scale wherein the subjects chose responses ranging from 1 to five: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = uncertain, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree, and five of the items have a reversed score. Some of the items included in this instrument are, "Tends to be lazy, is generally trusting and relaxed, handles stress well". Extraversion (items 1, and 6); Agreeableness (items 2, and 7); Conscientiousness (items 3, and 8); Neuroticism (items 4, and 9); and Openness (items 5, and 10). In the previous study by (Balgiu, 2018), the reliability of this scale was considered acceptable with Cronbach alpha coefficient of Extraversion (between 0.69 and 0.79), Neuroticism (between 0.71 and 0.73) and Conscientiousness (0.70) and weaker for openness (between 0.61 and 0.63), and agreeableness (between 0.51 and 0.65). This scale had a reliability coefficient of Cronbach's alpha Extraversion (0.21), Neuroticism (-0.05) and Conscientiousness (-0.20), openness (0.30) and agreeableness (-0.47).

Riverside Situational Q-Sort: was used to measure situational factors (Rauthmann & Sherman, 2015). This scale comprises a 24-item (DIAMONDS) short form of the original 89-item RSQ S8 with three items per dimension. The items are rated on a 7-point Likert scale wherein the subjects chose responses ranging from 1 to 5: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = somewhat disagree, 4 = neutral, 5 = somewhat agree, 6 = agree, to 7 = strongly agree. The reliability of the scale is considered acceptable with Cronbach alpha coefficient of Duty (0,89); Intellect (0,86); Adversity (0,78); Mating (0,62); pOsitivity (0,80); Negativity (0,86); Deception (0,80) and Sociality (0,85) in the study by Rauthmann and Sherman (2016). In this study, the scale had a reliability coefficient of Cronbach's alpha Duty (0,63); Intellect (0,82); Adversity (0,79); Mating (0,72); pOsitivity (0,83); Negativity (0,77); Deception (0,80) and Sociality (0,69).

3.7 RESEARCH APPROACH AND PROCEDURES

Ethical clearance and permission to conduct the research were obtained from the University's Research and Ethics Office before the questionnaire was administered. After being granted permission to conduct the study by the University, the researcher approached the Police Commissioner for each participating district who referred the researcher to Station Commanders to obtain permission to use their employees as participants in the research. After being granted permission, the researcher worked with the police officer appointed by their Station Commander on distributing questionnaires which included informed consent as a cover page and online survey link for participants who preferred technology. The questionnaires were distributed to participants who consented to be part of the study. To ensure that the working activities were not disrupted, the respondents were requested to submit the questionnaires to the police personnel appointed by their Station Commanders while online participants submitted electronically using *Google Drive Forms*^{TM}. The researcher collected the questionnaires from the appointed police personnel after participants completed the questionnaires. The participants were informed of their confidentiality and that participation was voluntary.

3.8 PILOT STUDY

A pilot study was carried out to ensure that the items in the questionnaire were clearly stated and had the same meaning to participants. It was also done to give the researcher an idea of how long it would take the participants to complete the questionnaire. In addition, it assisted in ensuring that the instrument did not have repetitive items and that the instructions for completing the questionnaire were precise and clear.

3.9 DATA ANALYSIS

Data analysis was defined by Merriam and Tisdell (2009) as "the process in which data is combined, reduced, and interpreted according to what and how the respondents will have responded and what the researcher read" (p.188). The IBM-SPSS version 26.0 was used to interpret the data. Descriptive statistics was used for the data analysis; specifically mean and standard deviation, to describe the

demographic data in summary, for instance, the frequencies and percentages. A study by Merriam (2009) highlighted that the use of descriptive statistics is also crucial in summarising data and it is important in interpreting the results of the quantitative research. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was conducted to determine whether there was a relationship between the workplace bullying, dispositional and situational factors. In order to test whether a significant relationship exists between the demographic variables of age, gender, highest education and work experience and the dependent variable of workplace bullying, correlation analysis was used.

3.10 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The study was conducted among police officers in Limpopo Province, South Africa. There were several ethical considerations which the researcher adhered to during the different stages of the research project. Ethics is defined by Leedy and Ormrod (2012 as "rules, guidelines or principles that regulate and recommend behaviour as morally acceptable or unacceptable". The following ethical considerations were adhered to when doing this research.

Informed consent: Participation by participants was voluntary; participants were aware of their rights to retract from the research at any given time if they feel like it. They were also informed about the purpose of the study, the importance of their participation and how the study results were to be used for. No one would face any penalty or be intimidated if they decided to leave or withdraw from the study.

Confidentiality and anonymity: The researcher guaranteed confidentiality by ensuring that no information given was divulged or made available to any other person. All the info attained was used only for study purposes and not for personal reasons. The scholar assured that the study was not harmful to the participants and that objectivity will be maintained when making a report on the data.

3.11 DELIMITATION OF THE STUDY

Snelson (2016) refer to delimitation as the representation of the scope and boundaries of a research study. The study was carried out in the various districts namely: Vhembe, Mopani and Capricorn around Limpopo Province, South Africa.

3.12 CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter provides an outline of the methods and the tools used when data was collected. A close-ended questionnaire was used to collect data from the participants. The population of the study comprised police officers from various districts namely: Vhembe, Mopani and Capricorn around Limpopo Province, South Africa. The researcher outlined the ethical considerations which were observed throughout the study.

4.1. INTRODUCTION

This Chapter presents the study results. These are presented in the form of descriptive statistics, correlation analysis and regression analysis results as obtained from the data. The reliability of the measuring instruments was established using the Cronbach's Alpha coefficients. Table 4.1 below shows the rule of thumb of labelling Cronbach's Alpha coefficient by Konting et al. (2009).

Table 4.1 *The Cronbach Alpha coefficient (Konting,et al,2009)*

Cronbach Alpha Value	Interpretation (Reliability)
0.91 – 1.00	Excellent
0.81 – 0.90	Good
0.71 – 0.80	Good and Acceptable
0.61 – 0.70	Acceptable
0.01 – 0.60	Non-Acceptable

Table 4.1 shows that the Cronbach Alpha Coefficient level which ranges from 0.91 – 1.00 represents reliability which is excellent, the one ranging from 0.81 – 0.90 represents good reliability. In addition, Cronbach Alpha coefficient that ranges from 0.71 – 0.80 represents good and acceptable reliability. Last, non-acceptable reliability is represented by Cronbach Alpha Coefficient that ranges from 0.01 – 0.60.

4.2. RELIABILITY OF THE VARIABLES

Table 4.2 *Reliability coefficients*

Scale	Number items	C Alpha	Reliability Level
Workplace bullying	22	0.96	Excellent
Dispositional factors	10	0.55	Non-Acceptable
Situational factors	24	0.78	Good and Acceptable

The Cronbach's Alpha was used to measure the reliability of all variables. The correlation coefficient ranges from plus or minus one. A high Alpha coefficient means that the reliability is also high. Pallant (2010) alluded that an item's total correlation should be at least, greater than 0.30 if not, then it is likely that the item is measuring a different thing entirely. All the Cronbach alpha coefficients in this study were above 0.30. This implies that the items were reliable. In this study, the Cronbach alpha coefficients were Workplace bullying α = 0.96 which is regarded as excellent reliability, Dispositional factors α = 0.55 which is regarded as non-acceptable reliability and Situational factors α = 0.78 which is regarded as vgood and acceptable reliability. Dispositional factors were below α = 0.70 which is non-acceptable.

4.3 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

An overview of the demographic factors of the sample was outlined by the descriptive statistics. The demographic results revealed in this study were for the following variables: gender, age, race, highest qualification, years of service, position and type of appointment.

Table 4.3: *Demographic statistics (gender)*

Gender	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Male	96	42.1
Female	103	45.2
Not say	9	3.9
Missing system	20	8.8

Table 4.3 above shows that among the participants, 96 (42.1%) were males, 88 (45.2%) were females, 9 (3.9%) preferred not to state their gender while 20 (8.8%) were missing. The results also revealed a gender imbalance because most of the participants were females.

Table 4.4: *Demographic statistics (age and race)*

Age	Frequency	Percentage (%)
25 years and below	9	4
26-35 years	72	31.5

University of Venda

36-45 years	82	36
46-55 years	33	14.4
56 years and above	12	5.3
Race		
Blacks	201	88.2
Whites	6	2.6
Coloreds	1	0.4

Table 4.4 above shows that most of the participants were between the age range of 36-45 years 86 (36%), followed by those between 26-35 years 72 (31.5%), 46-55 years 33 (14.4%), 56 years and above 12 (5.3%), and 9 (4%) were 25 years and below. Regarding race, Blacks participants dominated the study sample at 201 (88.2%), followed by whites at 6 (2.6%) and coloureds participants at 9 (0.4%).

Table 4.5: *Demographic statistics (Qualifications and years of service)*

Qualifications	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Matriculates	112	49.1
Certificates	20	8.8
Diplomas	42	18.4
Degrees	29	12.7
Honours Degrees	3	1.4
Masters	1	0.4
Other	1	0.4
Year (s) of service		
1-5 years	39	17
6-10 years	37	16.2
10 years and above	132	58

Table 4.5 above shows that majority of the participants have Matric as their highest qualification, 112 (49.1%), followed by those who had Diploma 42 (18.4%), Degree 29 (12.7%), Certificate 20 (8,8%), Honours 3 (1.4%) and only 1 participant was a holder of a Masters' degree 1 (0.5%) and another 1 participant's highest qualification is Grade 11. Regarding years of service, majority of the participants had more than 10 years

University of Venda

experience 132 (58%), followed by those who had between 1-5 years of experience 39 (17%) and those whose experience was between 6-10 years 37 (16.2%).

Table 4.6: *Demographic statistics (Positions and appointment type)*

Position	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Reserve	1	0.4
Constable	77	33.8
Sergeant	52	22.8
Warrant Officer	25	11.0
Brigadier	9	3.9
Captain	8	3.5
Lieutenant Colonel	31	13.6
Station Commander	5	2.2
Appointment type		
Contract	1	0.4
Temporary	1	0.4
Permanent	206	90.4

Table 4.6 above shows that most of the participants were Constables 77 (33.8%), followed by sergeants 52 (22.8%), Lieutenant Colonels 31 (13.6%), Warrant Officers 25 (11.0%), Brigadiers 9 (3.9%), Captains 8 (3.5%), Station Commanders 5 (2.2%) and only 1 participant was a reserve officer. In addition, majority of participants were permanent employees, 206 (90.4%), 1 (0.4%) was temporary and only 1 (0.4%) participant was a contract employee.

4.4. INFERENTIAL STATISTICS

The results on the intercorrelation analysis and stepwise multiple regression analysis are discussed below.

4.4.1. Inter-Correlations among variables with workplace bullying

The Pearson-product correlation assists in checking if there is a relationship between the independent and dependent variables. To access the association between the independent variables, situational factors, dispositional factors, gender, age, race,

qualification, years of experience, position, appointment type and the dependent variable (workplace bullying), the Pearson product correlation analysis was performed. The results of the correlational analysis in **Table 4.7** below shows that there was a positive significant relationship between dispositional factors and workplace bullying ($r = 0.19$; $p < 0.05$). This entails those dispositional factors that have an influence on workplace bullying amongst police officers. A positive significant relationship also existed between situational factors and workplace bullying, ($r = 0.31$; $p < 0.01$). This shows that when police officer's situational factors increase, so does bullying at their workplace. The results showed that there was a positive significant relationship between situational factors and dispositional factors ($r = 0.28$; $p < 0.01$). This means that situational and dispositional factors jointly and independently contributed positively and significantly to workplace bullying.

The results also revealed the relationships between the demographic variables of gender, age, qualification, years of experience and workplace bullying, as shown in **Table 4.7** below. It shows that there was no relationship between gender and workplace bullying ($r = -0.6$; $p > 0.05$). This means that gender does not have an impact on workplace bullying, thus police officers' workplace bullying is not influenced by gender in any way. Age had a positive significant relationship with workplace bullying ($r = 0.17$; $p < 0.05$). This means that age has an impact on police officers' being bullied at work. When their age increases, so does their bullying, especially on younger officers.

Table 4.7: *Mean, standard deviation and correlational matrix between variables in the study*

	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Gender	1.58	.57	1						
Age	39.12	9.09	-.30**	1					
Qualification	2.03	1.27	.01	.13*	1				
Years	14.18	9.12	-.29**	.89**	.01	1			
WPB	73.66	24.40	-.06	.17*	.21**	.00	1		
DF	32.00	5.35	.05	-.10*	.19*	-.19*	.19*	1	
SF	103.91	18.30	.08	-.02	.29**	-.08	.31**	.28**	1

Note: ** = $p < 0.01$ level; * = $p < 0.05$ level; WPB = Workplace Bullying; DF = Dispositional Factors; SF

The results further indicated that there was a positive significant relationship between qualifications and workplace bullying ($r = 0.21$; $p < 0.01$). This means that qualifications have an impact on workplace bullying. There was no relationship found between years of experience and workplace bullying ($r = 0.00$; $p > 0.05$). This means that years of experience does not have an impact on officers being bullied at work.

4.4.2 Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis

To determine the contribution of variables used in the study, a five-model stepwise multiple-regression analysis of workplace bullying on situational factors, on dispositional factors and on demographics (gender, age, qualifications and years of service) was computed. Qualification was entered in step 1, dispositional factors were entered in step 2, age was entered in step 3, years of experience were entered in step 4, qualification was entered in step 1 and removed in step 5.

University of Venda

Table 4.8: *Summary of stepwise multiple regression analysis on predictors of workplace bullying*

Model		SS	DF	MS	F	Sig.
1	Regression	5812.88	1	5812.88	10.26	.002
	Residual	114346.07	202	566.07		
	Total	120158.95	203			
2	Regression	8403.35	2	4482.64	8.10	.001
	Residual	111193.65	201	553.20		
	Total	120158.95	203			
3	Regression	11792.29	3	3930.97	7.25	.001
	Residual	108366.02	200	514.83		
	Total	120158.95	203			
4	Regression	19300.51	4	4525.12	9.52	.000
	Residual	100858.44	199	506.82		
	Total	120158.95	203			
5	Regression	18039.93	3	6013.31	11.77	.000
	Residual	10119.02	200	510.59		
	Total	120158.95	203			

Table 4.9: *Summary of Stepwise regression analysis for variables predicting Workplace Bullying*

Predictors	Model 1 B	Model 2 B	Model 3 B	Model 4 B	Model 5 B	
QUAL	.22**	.18**	.15**	.10**		
DF		.16**	.18**	.13**	.15**	
AGE			.15**	.67***	.73***	
YEARS				-.57***	-.62***	
R²	.048	.075	.098	.161	.150	
Change in R²	.048	.026	.024	.062	-.010	
F for change in R²	10.26*	5.69*	5.21*	14.81*	2.48*	

Note: *** = p < 0.001; ** = p < 0.01; * = p < 0.05; QUAL = Qualification; DF = Dispositional factors

The analysis shows that on the first model, qualification was a significant predictor of workplace bullying β = 0.22, p < 0.001, with the contribution of F (1,202) = 10.26, p < 0.001 and accounted for 4.8% of the variation in workplace bullying. At the second model of the regression, dispositional factors were a significant predictor of workplace bullying β = 0.15, p < 0.001, with contribution of F (2, 201) = 8.10, p < 0.001 and accounted for 7.5% of the variation in workplace bullying. At the third model of the regression, age was a significant predictor of workplace bullying β = 0,15, p < 0.001, with the contribution of F (3,200) = 7.25, p < 0.001 and accounted for 9.8% of variation in workplace bullying. At the fourth model of the regression, years of experience were also β = -0.57, p < 0.001, with the contribution of F (4,199) = 9.52, p< 0.01 and accounted for 16.1% of variation in workplace bullying. Finally, at the fifth model of the regression, with the contribution of F (5,200) = 11.77, p < 0.01 and accounted for 15% variation in workplace bullying. These results imply that qualifications, dispositional factors, age, and years of experience significantly contribute to workplace bullying. An absence of these variables, therefore, could result in a decrease in

workplace bullying. However, of all the five models, the most significant predictor of workplace bullying was qualification, which had a contribution of 4.8%.

4.5 CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter dealt with the presentation of results. The results revealed the Cronbach's Alpha coefficients of the variables which were being investigated. The intercorrelation analysis was carried out to determine the possible relationship between situational and dispositional factors on workplace bullying. Multiple regression analysis was also performed to determine the variables, which contributed on workplace bullying. The results indicated that years of experience, qualifications, dispositional factors and age, were the most contributors of workplace bullying.

CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

In the preceding chapter, data was presented and analysed. Chapter Five presents the discussion of the results of the study, conclusions, limitations of the study and recommendations for future research. The main objective of the study was to analyse and find out whether situational and dispositional factors have an influence on workplace bullying. Based on this objective, this Chapter gives a concluding interpretation of the study findings.

5.2 DISCUSSION

The demographic information, reliability, correlation and regression results are discussed below.

5.2.1 Inter Correlation results

The correlation analysis results were used to explain hypotheses 1, 2 and 3.

Hypothesis 1: *There is a significant relationship between dispositional factors and workplace bullying.*

The results revealed that there was a positive significant relationship between dispositional factors and workplace bullying. This entails that dispositional factors have an influence in bullying amongst police officers. This is consistent with Munir et al. (2021) whose findings revealed that personality traits significantly affect workplace bullying. The findings of Coyne et al. (2003) also suggest that personal factors can be an important predictor of workplace bullying as employees have different personalities. When dealing with exposure to bullying at work, an employee's personality is a very crucial element.

Hypothesis 2: *There is a significant relationship between situational factors and workplace bullying.*

The results also revealed that there was a positive significant relationship between situational factors and workplace bullying. This shows that situational factors have an impact as they promote bullying at work. When organisations have policies, practices and procedures which are very poor to protect the psychological health and safety of workers, employees are more likely to experience bullying (Samnani & Singh, 2016). Poor working environment is also a factor as it increases bullying directly and indirectly. The lack of protection from organisations to workers can make it even more difficult for employees to resist and respond to bullying behaviour from their co-workers (Law et al., 2011). In most cases, those in senior positions are the perpetrators of bullying because of power abuse and their leadership and management styles. In addition, Strandmark and Hallberg (2007) emphasised that weak leadership may promote bullying through a failure to resolve conflicts. Lack of a bullying policy can lead to employees believing that their organisation tolerates bullying (Miller et al., 2020).

Hypothesis 3: *Socio-demographic and situational factors will jointly and independently contribute positively and significantly to workplace bullying.*

On the demographic factors (gender, race, position and type of appointment) predicting workplace bullying, the results indicated that there is no significant relationship. This implies that workplace bullying is not influenced by the fact that the employees are male or female, their race, positions and their appointment types. The results show that both genders have an equal ability of being bullied irrespective of their gender, race, positions and types of appointment. These findings correspond with the results of few researchers who found no significant relationship between gender and workplace bullying (Botha, 2019; Einarsen & Skogstad, 1996; Leymann, 1996). However, research findings by Salin (2021) show that the relationships between gender and bullying are complex and often even contradictory. However, the results revealed that age has a positive significant relationship with workplace bullying. This finding is supported by Mabasa (2021) who found that, in the African world of work, age can be seen as a contributing factor of bullying behaviour.

This means that as one's age increases, bullying at workplace also increases. Studies regarding the age reported mixed findings as Einarsen and Skogstad (1996) reported that as compared to younger ones, older employees have a higher likelihood of being

bullied while other studies reported contradicting results (Vartia, 1996). An increase in years of experience and qualifications also fuels bullying at workplace. This findings are supported by Badenhorst and Botha (2022) who revealed that there is a significant relationship between the length of employment and workplace bullying.

5.2.2 Discussion of Stepwise multiple regression results

The results of the stepwise multiple regression analysis showed that demographic factors (qualification, age and years of experience) and dispositional factors were significantly contributing to workplace bullying. This shows that an absence of all these factors would result in a decrease in workplace bullying. However, the variable which contributed most to workplace bullying was qualification. This indicates that indeed, qualification is related and does contribute to workplace bullying. These results are consistent with Cunniff and Mostert (2012) and Brown et al. (2020) whose findings revealed that employees with lower education levels experienced more workplace bullying than employees with higher education levels.

Namie (2017) revealed in the Workplace Bullying Survey of the Workplace Bullying Institute in the USA that most of the bullies were bosses; most of the perpetrators had a higher rank than their targets, followed by peers and subordinates. Cunniff (2011) showed that individuals with lower education status or no formal education experienced more frequent workplace bullying than their counterparts with higher education status and skills. In addition, Cunniff (2011) confirmed Ortega et al. (2009)'s study in Norway, which found that those employees with lower educational status reported more long-term exposure to the prevalence of bullying than their colleagues with higher level of education and skills. Research conducted by Hoel and Cooper (2000) revealed that bullying affects managers and those without managerial responsibility equally. However, the same study reveals that managers or those in superior formal positions were reported as perpetrators in most of the incidences, followed by peers or colleagues, subordinates and clients.

This is so because the level of bullying would be high such that the individuals would strive to be productive due to deterioration in interpersonal relationships, inconsistency in demands and stress by their educated colleagues. This explains why qualification is a strong predictor of workplace bullying.

5.3. CONCLUSIONS

This study aimed at finding the situational and dispositional factors influencing workplace bullying among police officers in Limpopo province, South Africa. The study findings showed that indeed, situational and dispositional factors do influence workplace bullying. Furthermore, the demographic variables of qualification, age and years of service had a relationship with workplace bullying, except for race, gender, position and appointment type which showed no significant relationship with it. The stepwise multiple regression analysis results also indicated that demographic factors (qualification, age and years of experience) and dispositional factors had a contribution on workplace bullying. However, qualification contributed most. This clearly shows that indeed, majority of police officers are the mostly bullied at their workplaces due to their educational background which is matric.

5.4. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Although the study achieved its aims and objectives, there were some unavoidable limitations. The first was financial constraint. The data collection period was limited to some police stations due to financial constraints. If the researcher could access financial support, she could have obtained a much larger sample. The second limitation is that the study was conducted among police stations in three districts of Limpopo province, which were geographically dispersed, so the researcher faced challenges when moving from one police station to the other during data collection and the process of moving around was exhausting.

Third, the researcher also noted that most police officers did not participate in the study because of their busy schedules. Some hinted that they don't see any reason to participate as it has nothing to do with increasing their salaries. This was a limitation because those employees who refused to participate in the study, could have potentially provided some important information, which could have made an equally potential difference here. Fourth, the participants' experiences, emotions and feelings were provoked as the researcher received anonymous calls from participants expressing their bullying experiences at the police sector, which may have been triggered by the questions asked on the questionnaires.

5.5 RECOMMENDATIONS

5.5.1 Recommendations for Practice

The study recommends that organisations should take into consideration the factors which influence bullying at work. It is now the duty of the organisation and its role players to see to it that they create a conducive and friendly work environment for productivity of employees and increasing employee morale. Fox and Stallworth (2009) noted that the prevalence of workplace bullying differs across organisations, therefore remedial education, coaching and training should be tailored according to specific needs of organisations. This can be achieved if employers encourage employees to further their studies and organise workshops and awareness whereby police officers will be taught more about workplace bullying.

Second, since the findings indicated that qualification was the most significant predictor of workplace bullying, the study recommends that employers should take the aspect of education very seriously and further their studies to reduce bullying at police stations and that does not mean officers must relax with their matric after employment as we are in the 21st century. Salin (2008) explained that education and training sharpen employees' and managers' competence in dealing with bullying and implementing policies. By so doing, their self-confidence will be enhanced, which will persuade them to be productive for their own benefit and the benefit of their organisation and colleagues.

Thirdly, occupational health and safety policies must include code of conduct which aims to address workplace bullying as it is a health matter. It is the safety officer's responsibility to ensure that all employees irrespective of their position, status and power influence their colleagues to understand the policy of workplace bullying. Furthermore, the employees will be encouraged by understanding what bullying entails, the role of the safety officer and remedies available to them when having to deal with bullying behaviour.

Lastly, this study could add value to the South African Police Service by providing a rich ground to its management to be more informed about workplace bullying as well as assisting them to improve the commitment of their staff so that they can achieve their mission of preventing and combating anything that may threaten the safety and

security of any security. Policy makers should also highlight the importance of having workplace bullying policies for employee satisfaction, productivity and organisational wellness. All these recommendations could be successful if SAPS put these ideas as part of their strategy to fulfill their mission.

5.5.2 Recommendations for future research

This study will have positive implications for working relations because as employees will start trusting each other, they are more likely to be committed to their job, reducing absenteeism and poor performance and guiding management in minimising workplace bullying.

The study recommends that a similar study could be carried out involving other occupational groups to determine the impact and consequence of a workplace bullying policy and how this can be remedied, using interviews to obtain enough subjective feedback from participants (Merriam, 2009). The present study has explored the personality traits as dispositional factors of workplace bullying. Future research should include bystanders and perpetrators in the research to have a complete picture of bullying by adding the important work-related constructs.

5.6 CHAPTER SUMMARY

The study aimed to assess whether situational and dispositional factors have an influence on workplace bullying. The demographic statistics and variables such as age, gender, race, position, qualification, appointment type and years of service were outlined. The chapter also highlighted the intercorrelation and stepwise multiple regression analysis. The limitations and recommendations were also discussed.

Ackerman, C. (2017). The big five personality theory: The 5 factor model explained. *Positive Psychology Program*.

Adcroft, A., & Willis, R. (2005), The (un)intended outcome of public sector performance measurement. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 18(4/5), 386–400.

Adewumi, O., & Danesi, R. (2017). Gender: A Vulnerability Factor or Not? Exploring and Investigating Workplace Bullying in Nigeria. *Journal of Economics, Business and Management*, *5*(10), 324-330.

Ahmad, F., Gul, A., Hamid, S. A. R., Mahmood, Z., & Mariam, S. (2021). Employees'own Personality May Induce Their Victimization At Work: Evidence From Universities In Lahore. *Bulletin of Business and Economics (BBE)*, *10*(4), 13-21.

Ahmed, I., & Ishtiaq, S. (2021). Reliability and Validity: Importance in medical research. *Journal of the Pakistan Medical Association*, *71*(10), 2401-2406.

Aliyu, A. A., Bello, M. U., Kasim, R., & Martin, D. (2014). Positivist and non-positivist paradigm in social science research: Conflicting paradigms or perfect partners? *Journal of Management and Sustainability*, *4*(3), 79-95. https://doi.org/10.5539/jms.v4n3p79.

Allport, G. (1961) Situations: Real and Construed: Project Description: The Construal of Situations, 266.

Allport, G. W. (1931). What is a trait of personality?. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, *25*(4), 368.

Aquino, K., & Bradfield, M. (2000). Perceived victimisation in the workplace: The role of situational factors and victim characteristics. *Organisation Science*, *11*(5), 525-537.

Aquino, K., & Byron, K. (2002). Dominating interpersonal behaviour and perceived victimisation in groups: Evidence for a curvilinear relationship. *Journal of Management*, 28(1), 69-87.

University of Venda

Aquino, K., & Lamerts, K. (2004). A relational model of workplace victimisation: social roles and patterns of victimisation in dyadic relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89*(6), 1023-1034.

Aquino, K., & Thau, S. (2009). Workplace victimisation: Aggression from the target's perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60, 717–741.

Babbie, E. A. (2008). The basics of social research. Thomson Learning. *Inc. USA*.

Babcock, S. E., & Wilson, C. A. (2020). Big Five model of personality. *The Wiley Encyclopedia of Personality and Individual Differences: Personality Processes and Individual Differences*, 55-60.

Badenhorst, M., & Botha, D. (2022). Workplace bullying in a South African higher education institution: Academic and support staff experiences. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, *20*(0), 1909.

Baillien, E., De Cuyper, N., & De Witte, H. (2011). Job autonomy and workload as antecedents of workplace bullying: A two-wave test of Karasek's job demand-control model for targets and perpetrators. *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psycholog*y, 84, 191–208.

Baillien, E., Neyens, I., De Witte, H., & De Cuyper, N. (2009). A qualitative study on the development of workplace bullying: Towards a three-way model. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 19(1), 1-16.

Balgiu, B. A. (2018). The psychometric properties of the Big Five inventory-10 (BFI-10) including correlations with subjective and psychological well-being. *Global Journal of Psychology Research: New Trends and Issues*, *8*(2), 61-69.

Baron, R & Neumann, J 1996, 'Workplace violence and workplace aggression: Evidence on their relative frequency and potential causes', *Aggressive Behaviour*, 22, 161-173.

Bartlett, J. E., & Bartlett, M. E. (2011). Workplace bullying: An integrative literature review. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, *13*(1), 69-84.

Baseline Report. (2018, January, 30). Sexual harassment in the workplace in Swaziland: A Focus on the Private Sector and Non-Governmental Organisations. *Swaziland Economic Policy Analysis and Research Centre*, Swaziland.

University of Venda

Battaglia, M. (2008). Purposive sample. *Encyclopedia of survey research methods*, 646.

Bernstein, C., & Trimm, L. (2016). The impact of workplace bullying on individual wellbeing: The moderating role of coping. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, *14*(1), 1-12.

Bhardwaj, P. (2019). Types of sampling in research. *Journal of the Practice of Cardiovascular Sciences*, *5*(3), 157.

Bingham, C. (2016). *Employment relations: fairness and trust in the workplace*. Sage.

Björkqvist, K., Österman, K., & Hjelt-Bäck, M. (1994). Aggression among university employees. *Aggressive Behaviour*, 20, 173-184.

Bless, C., Higson-Smith, C., & Sithole, S. L. (2013). *Fundamentals of social research methods: An African Perspective* (5th ed.). Cape Town, SA: Juta.

Bond, S. A., Tuckey, M. R., & Dollard, M. F. (2010). Psychosocial safety climate, Workplace Bullying, and symptoms of post-traumatic stress. *Organisation Development Journal*, *28*(1), 37-56.

Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2004). Personality and transformational and transactional leadership: a meta-analysis. *Journal of applied psychology*, *89*(5), 901-910.

Botha, D. (2019). Employees' perceptions and experiences of bullying in the workplace. *Journal of Contemporary Management*, *16*(1), 180-208.

Botha, W. (2010). *Developing an understanding of bullying targets' experience of and coping with abusive workplace situations*. University of Johannesburg (South Africa).

Bowling, N. A., & Beehr, T. A. (2006). Workplace harassment from the victim's perspective: A theoretical model and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 998– 1012.

Brown, J. M., & Campbell, E. A. (1994). *Stress and policing: Sources and strategies*. John Wiley & Sons.

Brown, L. R., Mason, B., & Carter, M. (2020). Workplace bullying from the perspectives of trainee clinical psychologists. *The Journal of Mental Health Training, Education and Practice*, *16*(2), 139-152.

Brunetto, Y., Farr-Wharton, R. & Shacklock, K. (2011). Using the Harvard HRM model to conceptualize the impact of changes to supervision upon HRM outcomes. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 22, 553–573.

Brunetto, Y., Farr-Wharton, R. & Shacklock, K. (2012). Emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, wellbeing and engagement: explaining organizational commitment and turnover intentions in policing. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 22(4), 428–441.

Bruursema, K., Kessler, S. R., & Spector, P. E. (2011). Bored employees misbehaving: The relationship between boredom and counterproductive work behaviour. *Work and Stress*, 25, 93–107.

Bryman, A. (2012). Sampling in qualitative research. *Social research methods*, *4*, 415-429.

Bryman, A. (2016). *Social research methods*. Oxford university press.

Bryman, A., & Bell, E. (2011). Ethics in business research. *Business Research Methods* (3rd ed.) Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., & Guido, G. (2001). Brand personality: How to make the metaphor fit? *Journal of Economic Psychology*, *22*(3), 377–395.

Catherine Scheeler, M., Markelz, A., Taylor, J. C., Deshpande, D. S., & Wolfe, P. (2021). Teacher Workplace Bullying: How Pervasive is the Problem?. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 08884064211015698.

Catley, B., Blackwood, K., Forsyth, D., Tappin, D., & Bentley, T. (2017). Workplace Bullying complaints: lessons for good HR practice. *Personnel Review*, 46(1), 100-114.

Chappell, D., & Di Martino, V. (2006). *Violence at work*. Geneva: International Labour Organisation.

Christopher, A. N., Zabel, K. L., & Miller, D. E. (2013). Personality, Authoritarianism, Social Dominance, and Ambivalent Sexism: A Mediational Model. *Individual Differences Research*, *11*(2), 70-80.

Cilliers, F. (2012). A systems psychodynamic description of organisational bullying experiences. *South Africa Journal of Industrial Psychology, 38*(2), 1-11.

Conco, D. N., Baldwin-Ragaven, L., Christofides, N. J., Libhaber, E., Rispel, L. C., White, J. A., & Kramer, B. (2021). Experiences of workplace bullying among academics in a health sciences faculty at a South African university. *South African Medical Journal*, *111*(4), 315-320.

Constitution of the Republic of South Africa. (1996). Pretoria: Government Printers.

Corbett, W. R. (2004). The need for a revitalised common law of the workplace. *Workers' Comparative Law Reviewed*, 91, 125–27.

Cortina, L. M., Kabat-Farr, D., Magley, V. J., & Nelson, K. (2017). Researching rudeness: The past, present, and future of the science of incivility. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *22*(3), 299.

Cortina, L. M., Magley, V. J., Williams, J. H., & Langhout, R. D. (2001). Incivility in the workplace: incidence and impact. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, *6*(1), 64-80.

Cortina, L. M., Rabelo, V. C., & Holland, K. J. (2018). Beyond blaming the victim: Toward a more progressive understanding of workplace mistreatment. *Industrial and Organisational Psychology*, *11*(1), 81-100.

Costa Jr, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (2013). *Personality in adulthood: A five-factor theory perspective*. Guilford Press.

Cowan, R. L., Clayton, E., & Bochantin, J. (2021). Human resources as an important actor in workplace bullying situations: Where we have been and where we should go. *Pathways of Job-related Negative Behaviour*, 477-494.

Cowie, H., Jennifer, D., Neto, C., Angula, J. C., Pereira, B., Del Barrio, C., & Ananiadou, K. (2000, September). Comparing the nature of workplace bullying in two European countries: Portugal and the UK. In *Transcending the*

University of Venda

boundaries: Integrating people, processes and systems. Proceedings of the 2000 Conference. Brisbane: Griffith University. 128-133.

Cowie, H., Naylor, P., Rivers, I., Smith, P. K., & Pereira, B. (2002). Measuring Workplace Bullying. *Aggression and Violent Behaviour*, *7*(1), 33-51.

Cox, T. (1978). Stress. London: Macmillan Press.

Coyne, I., Chong, P. S. L., Seigne, E., & Randall, P. (2003). Self and peer nominations of bullying: An analysis of incident rates, individual differences, and perceptions of the working environment. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 12*, 209–228.

Coyne, I., Seigne, E. & Randall, P. (2000). Predicting workplace victim status from personality. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology,* 9(3), 335–349.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method approaches*. Sage publications.

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2016). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Sage publications.

Crimininal Juctice report (2012). 3 Modern Theories of Victimology: *Criminal Justice, Government, and Public Administration*, Grand Canyon University. Retrieved September 02, 2019.

Crothers, L. M., Lipinski, J., & Minutolo, M. C. (2009). Cliques, rumors, and gossip by the water cooler: Female bullying in the workplace. *The Psychologist-Manager Journal*, *12*(2), 97-110.

Cunniff, L. (2011). *Workplace bullying of South African employees: Prevalence and the relationship with sense of coherence and diversity experiences* (Doctoral dissertation, North-West University).

Cunniff, L., & Mostert, K. (2012). Prevalence of Workplace Bullying of South African employees. *South African Journal of Human Resource Management, 10*(1), 1-15.

University of Venda

De Cuyper, N., Baillien, E., & De Witte, H. (2009). Job insecurity, perceived employability and targets' and perpetrators' experiences of workplace bullying. *Work & Stress*, 23(3), 206-224.

De Wet, C., & Jacobs, L. (2013). South African teachers' exposure to workplace bullying. *TD: The Journal for Transdisciplinary Research in Southern Africa*, *9*(3), 446-464.

Dehue, F., Bolman, C., Völlink, T., & Pouwelse, M. (2012). Coping with bullying at work and health related problems. *International Journal of Stress Management*, *19*(3), 175-197.

Descartes, R. (2008). *Discourse on Method and Meditations on First Philosophy* (4th ed.). Indianapolis, IN: Hacketts.

Dick, G. P. (2008). The influence of managerial factors on bullying in the police. *Kent Business School Working Paper Series No.* 179.

Drabek, M., Merecz, D., & Mościcka, A. (2007). Exposure to aggression at work in the health care and public service sectors. *Medycyna pracy*, *58*(4), 299-306.

Du Plessis M. (2017). Health, safety, and wellness. In Nel P & Werner A. Eds. *Human resource management*. Oxford University Press, 209-234.

Einarsen, S. (1999). The nature and causes of bullying at work. *International Journal of Manpower,* 20(1/2), 16-27. https://doi.org/10.1108/01437729910268588

Einarsen, S. V., Hoel, H., Zapf, D., & Cooper, C. L. (2020). The concept of bullying and harassment at work: The European tradition. In *Bullying and harassment in the workplace*, 3-53. CRC press.

Einarsen, S., & Raknes, B. I. (1997). Harassment in the workplace and the victimisation of men. *Violence and victims*, *12*(3), 247-263.

Einarsen, S., & Skogstad, A. (1996). Bullying at work: Epidemiological findings in public and private organisations. *European journal of work and organisational psychology*, *5*(2), 185-201.

University of Venda

Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., & Notelaers, G. (2009). Measuring exposure to bullying and harassment at work: Validity, factor structure and psychometric properties of the Negative Acts Questionnaire-Revised. *Work and stress*, *23*(1), 24-44.

Einarsen, S., Raknes, B. R. I., & Matthiesen, S. B. (1994). Bullying and harassment at work and their relationships to work environment quality: An exploratory study. *European Journal of Work and Organisational Psychology*, *4*(4), 381-401.

Elias, R. (1986). The politics of victimisation: Victims, victimology, and human rights. *OUP Catalogue*.

Famolu, F. (2015). Trends and prevalence of bullying at the workplace in Nigeria. Osun State University.

Farrington, D. (1993). Understanding and preventing bullying. In M. Tonry (Ed.), *Crime and justice: a review of research*, 17. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Farr-Wharton, B., Shacklock, K., Brunetto, Y., Teo, S. T., & Farr-Wharton, R. (2017). Workplace Bullying, workplace relationships, and job outcomes for police officers in Australia. *Public Money and Management*, *37*(5), 325-332.

Finchilescu, G., Bernstein, C., & Chihambakwe, D. (2019). The impact of workplace bullying in the Zimbabwean nursing environment: is social support a beneficial resource in the bullying–well-being relationship?. *South African journal of psychology*, *49*(1), 83-96.

Fisher, C. (2015). The association of different types of bullying with the mental health of children and teens from the United States, France, and Canada.

Fox, S., & Stallworth, L. E. (2009). Building a framework for two internal organizational approaches to resolving and preventing workplace bullying: Alternative dispute resolution and training. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, *61*(3), 220.

Francioli, L., Høgh, A., Conway, P. M., Costa, G., Karasek, R., & Hansen, Å. M. (2016). Do personal dispositions affect the relationship between psychosocial working conditions and workplace bullying? *Ethics and Behaviour*, *26*(6), 451-469.

University of Venda

Funder, D. C. (2006). Towards a resolution of the personality triad: Persons, situations, and behaviours. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *40*(1), 21-34.

Funder, D. C. (2013). Taking situations seriously. *Honolulu: Division*, *8*. Presidential Address, American Psychological Association, Honolulu.

Funder, D. C. (2016). Taking situations seriously: The situation construal model and the Riverside Situational Q-Sort. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *25*(3), 203-208.

Funder, D.C. (2009). Persons, behaviours and situations: An agenda for personality psychology in the postwar era. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 43, 120-126.

Gelo, O., Braakmann, D., & Benetka, G. (2008). Quantitative and qualitative research: Beyond the debate. *Integrative psychological and behavioural science*, 42(3), 266- 290.

Gholipour, A., Sanjari, S. S., Bod, M., & Kozekanan, S. F. (2011). Organisational bullying and women stress in workplace. *International Journal of Business and Management*, *6*(6), 234-241.

Gibson, D. (2016). Harassment in the Workplace–European Perspectives. In *The Handbook of Dealing with Workplace Bullying*, 225-240. Routledge.

Gillen, P. A., Sinclair, M., Kernohan, W. G., Begley, C. M., & Luyben, A. G. (2017). Interventions for prevention of bullying in the workplace. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD009778.pub2.

Glasø, L., Matthiesen, S. B., Nielsen, M. B., & Einarsen, S. (2007). Do targets of workplace bullying portray a general victim personality profile?. *Scandinavian journal of psychology*, *48*(4), 313-319.

Gobind, J. (2015). *South African employment relations in context*. Johannesburg: Knowledge Resources Publishing.

Grant, C., & Osanloo, A. (2014). Understanding, selecting, and integrating a theoretical framework in dissertation research: Developing a "blueprint" for your house. *Administrative Issues Journal Education Practice and Research*, 4 (2), 12–26.

Greer, O. L., & Schmelsle, G. D. (2009). Are you being bullied? You are not alone. *Strategic Finance*, *91*(3), 41-46.

Grice, J. (2006). Five-factor model of personality. In Encyclopedia of human development. Retrieved from http://0search.credoreference.com.bianca.penlib.du.edu/content/entry/sagehd/five_factor_model_of_personality/0.

Grice, J. W. (2021). Drawing inferences from randomization tests. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *179*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2021.110931.

Grinnell Jr, R. M., & Unrau, Y. A. (2010). *Social work research and evaluation: Foundations of evidence-based practice*. Oxford University Press.

Grohol, J. M. (2019). The Big Five Personality Traits. Retrieved from https://psychcentral.com/lib/the-big-five-personality-traits/.

Gupta, P., Gupta, U., & Wadhwa, S. (2020). Known and unknown aspects of workplace bullying: A systematic review of recent literature and future research agenda. *Human Resource Development Review*, *19*(3), 263-308.

Harassment Info Sheet CCMA-I832-2018-01. Retrieved March 18, 2020. From www.ccma.org.sa/advice/Information-sheet.

Harthill, S. (2011). Workplace bullying as an occupational safety and health matter: A comparative analysis. *Hastings International and Comparative Law Review*, *34*, 253.

Hauge, L. J., Skogstad, A., & Einarsen, S. (2007). Relationships between stressful work environments and bullying: Results of a large representative study. *Work and stress*, *21*(3), 220-242.

Henle, C. A., & Gross, M. A. (2014). What have I done to deserve this? Effects of employee personality and emotion on abusive supervision. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *122*(3), 461-474.

Hentig, H. V. (1948). The criminal and his victim: studies in the sociobiology of crime, 1, 461. *Yale University Press*. USA.

University of Venda

Hepworth, W., & Towler, A. (2004). The effects of individual differences and charismatic leadership on workplace aggression. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 9, 176–185.

Hershcovis, M. S., Turner, N., Barling, J., Arnold, K. A., Dupré, K. E., Inness, M., & Sivanathan, N. (2007). Predicting workplace aggression: a meta-analysis. *Journal of applied Psychology*, 92(1), 228-238.

Hoel, H., & Cooper, C. L. (2000). *Destructive conflict and bullying at work*. Manchester: Manchester School of Management, UMIST.

Hoel, H., Cooper, C. L., & Faragher, B. (2001). The experience of bullying in Great Britain: The impact of organizational status. *European journal of work and organizational psychology*, *10*(4), 443-465.

Hunter, D. Y., & Bandow, D. (2009). Abusive managers and variables impacting retaliation in organisations. *The Business Review*, *12*(1), 32-38.

International Labour Organisation, International Council of Nurses, World Health Organisation & Public Services International (2000). Joint programme on workplace violence in the health sector. http://www.who.int/violence_injury_prevention/injury/work9/en/index1.html. Accessed Sept 03, 2015.

Jennifer, D., Cowie, H., & Ananiadou, K. (2003). Perceptions and experience of Workplace Bullying in five different working populations. *Aggressive Behaviour*, 29(6), 489-496.

Jensen-Campbell, L. A., & Graziano, W. G. (2001). Agreeableness as a moderator of interpersonal conflict. *Journal of personality*, *69*(2), 323-362.

John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. *Handbook of personality: Theory and research*, *2*(1999), 102-138.

Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2000). Five-factor model of personality and transformational leadership. *Journal of applied psychology*, *85*(5), 751-765.

Keashly, L., & Jagatic, K. (2011). North American perspectives on hostile behaviours and bullying at work. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C. Cooper (Eds.), *Bullying and harassment in the workplace: Developments in theory, research, and practice.* 2, 41–71. Boca Raton: CRC Press.

Kivimäki, M., Elovainio, M., & Vahtera, J. (2000). Workplace bullying and sickness absence in hospital staff. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, *57*(10), 656-660.

Konting, M. M., Kamaruddin, N., & Man, N. A. (2009). Quality Assurance in Higher Education Institutions: Exit Survey among Universities Putra Malaysia Graduating Students. *International Education Studies*, *2*(1), 25-31.

Kulahci, I. G., Ghasanfar, A. A., & Rubenstein, D. I. (2018). Consistent individual variation across interaction networks indicates social personalities in lemurs. *Animal behaviour*, *136*, 217-226.

Law talk (2021). Four Theories of Victimology Explained, https://elawtalk.com/category/law/criminal-law.html. Accessed April 30, 2021.

Law, R., Dollard, M. F., Tuckey, M. R., & Dormann, C. (2011). Psychosocial safety climate as a lead indicator of workplace bullying and harassment, job resources, psychological health and employee engagement. *Accident Analysis & Prevention*, *43*(5), 1782-1793.

Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping.* Springer publishing company.

Lee, R. T., & Brotheridge, C. M. (2006). When prey turns predatory: Workplace bullying as a predictor of counteraggression/bullying, coping, and well-being. *European Journal of Work and Organisational Psychology*, *15*(3), 352-377.

Leedy, P. D., & Ormrod, J. (2012). *Practical Research*, 10th Ed., Boston, Pearson.

Leephaijaroen, S. (2016). Effects of the big-five personality traits and organizational commitments on organizational citizenship behaviour of support staff at Ubon Ratchathani Rajabhat University, Thailand. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences*, *37*(2), 104-111.

University of Venda

Lewis, J., Coursol, D., & Wahl, K. H. (2002). Addressing issues of workplace harassment: Counseling the targets. *Journal of Employment Counseling*, 39(3), 109-116.

Leymann, H. (1996). The content and development of mobbing at work. *European journal of work and organisational psychology*, 5(2), 165-184.

Lim, A. (2020). *The big five personality traits*. https://www.simplypsychology.org/bigfivepersonality.html. Accessed June, 2020.

Lutgen-Sandvik, P., & Tracy, S. J. (2012). Answering five key questions about Workplace Bullying: How communication scholarship provides thought leadership for transforming abuse at work. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *26*(1), 3-47.

Lysaght, S. (2011). Epistemological and paradigmatic ecumenism in "Pasteur's Quadrant:" Tales from doctoral research. In *Official conference proceedings of the third Asian Conference on Education in Osaka, Japan*, 567-579.

Mabasa, F.D. 2021. *An indigenous South African perspective on workplace bullying (Unpublished doctoral dissertation).* University of Limpopo, South Africa.

Magee, C., Gordon, R., Caputi, P., Oades, L., Reis, S., & Robinson, L. (2014). *Workplace Bullying in Australia.* Wollongong, NSW: University of Wollongong.

Małgorzata, W., Merecs, D., & Drabek, M. (2010). Stress prevention programs--strategies, techniques, effectiveness. Part II. Organisational activities to prevent stress at work. *Medycyna pracy*, *61*(2), 191-204.

Matthiesen, S. B., & Einarsen, S. (2004). Psychiatric distress and symptoms of PTSD among victims of bullying at work. *British journal of guidance and counselling*, 32(3), 335-356.

Mayhew, C. (2001). Occupational health and safety risks faced by police officers. *Trends and issues in crime and criminal justice*, 196, 1-6.

McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (2008). The five-factor theory of personality. In O. P. John, R. W. Robins, & L. A. Pervin (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research*, 159–181. The Guilford Press.

University of Venda

McFadden, K., & Altamirano, M. A. (2020). Situational Factors and Increased Workplace Burnout: A Study of Influences Affecting Current Younger Employees. *Nurturing Collective Knowledge and Intelligence: Social phenomena and implications for practice*, *2*(1), 45.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). Qualitative research*: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publisher.

Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2009). Qualitative data analysis. *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*, 169-207. John Wiley & Sons.

Milcsarek, M., Vartia, M., & Pahkin, K. (2010). European Agency for Safety and Health at Work, EU-OSHA. *Workplace Violence and Harassment: a European Picture. European Risk Observatory Report. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union*, *111*.

Miller, P., Brook, L., Stomski, N., Ditchburn, G., & Morrison, P. (2020). Bullying in Fly-In-Fly-Out employees in the Australian resources sector: A cross-sectional study. *Plus one*, *15*(3).

Mokgolo, M. M. (2017). *Workplace Bullying: a human resource practitioner perspective* [Doctoral dissertation, University of South Africa] Pretoria.

Monks, C. P., & Smith, P. K. (2006). Definitions of bullying: Age differences in understanding of the term and the role of experience. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 24(4), 801-821.

Moreno-Jiménes, B., & Muños, A. R. (2006). Monographic issue on psychological harassment at work: an overview. *Journal of Work and Organisational Psychology*, 22(3), 245-249.

Morse, P., Sweeny, K., & Legg, A. M. (2015). A situational construal approach to healthcare experiences. *Social Science and Medicine*, 138, 170-178.

Mouton, J., & Waast, R. (2009). Comparative study on national research systems: Findings and lessons. *Higher education, research and innovation: Changing dynamics*, 147-169.

Muftić, L. R., & Hunt, D. E. (2013). Victim Precipitation: Further understanding the linkage between victimisation and offending in homicide. *Homicide Studies*, *17*(3), 239-254.

Munir, M., Ali, M., & Haider, S. K. (2021). Investigating Personality Traits as the Antecedents of Workplace Bullying. *International Review of Management and Business Research*, 10(1).

Namie, G. (2003). Workplace Bullying: Escalated incivility. *Ivey Business Journal*, *68*(2), 1-6.

Namie, G. (2017). 2017 workplace bullying institute US workplace bullying survey. *Workplace Bullying Institute website,* available at: https://workplacebullying.org/multi/pdf/2017/2017-WBI-US-Survey.pdf. Accessed January 23, 2019.

Namie, G., & Namie, R. (2000). Workplace bullying. *USA research, Avalaible at: http://www.workplacebullying.org/multi/pdf/NN-2000.pdf*.

Namie, G., & Namie, R. (2009). US Workplace bullying: Some basic considerations and consultation interventions. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, *61*(3), 202-219.

National Center Against Bullying. (2021). Definition of bullying: Alannah and Madeline Foundation.

Ncongwane, S. (2012). *Bullying and violence in the workplace*. Retrieved October 16, 2013. From http://www.hrfuture.net/on-the-cover/bullying-and-violence-in-the-workplace-2.php?Itemid=33.

Ndegwa, I. N., & Moronge, M. (2016). Effects of workplace bullying on employee performance in the civil service in Kenya: A case of the ministry of education, science and technology. *The Strategic Journal of Business and Change Management*, *3*(2), 1-31.

Nelen, J. M., & Siegel, D. (Eds.). (2021). *Contemporary organised crime: developments, challenges and responses*, 18, Springer Nature.

Nielsen, M. B., & Einarsen, S. (2018). What we know, what we do not know, and what we should and could have known about Workplace Bullying: An overview of the

University of Venda

literature and agenda for future research. *Aggression and Violent Behaviour*, *42*, 71–83.

Nielsen, M. B., & Knardahl, S. (2015). Is Workplace Bullying related to the personality traits of victims? A two-year prospective study. *Work and Stress*, *29*(2), 128–149.

Nielsen, M. B., Gjerstad, J., Jacobsen, D. P., & Einarsen, S. V. (2017). Does ability to defend moderate the association between exposure to bullying and symptoms of anxiety? *Frontiers in psychology*, 7(*8*), 1953. Doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01953. PMID: 29163321; PMCID: PMC5682040.

Occupational Health and Safety Act 85 of 1993.

Olweus, D. (1978). *Aggression in the schools: Bullies and whipping boys*. American Psychological Association, Hemisphere.

Olweus, D. (1991). Bully/victim problems among schoolchildren: Basic facts and effects of a school-based intervention program. *The development and treatment of childhood aggression*, *17*(17), 411-448.

Olweus, D. (1993). Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 140.

Ones, D. S., & Viswesvaran, C. (2001). Integrity tests and other criterion-focused occupational personality scales (COPS) used in personnel selection. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, *9*(1–2), 31–39.

Ortega, R., Elipe, P., Mora-Merchán, J. A., Calmaestra, J., & Vega, E. (2009). The emotional impact on victims of traditional bullying and cyberbullying: A study of Spanish adolescents. *Zeitschrift für Psychologie/Journal of Psychology*, *217*(4), 197-204.

Osanloo, A., & Grant, C. (2016). Understanding, selecting, and integrating a theoretical framework in dissertation research: Creating the blueprint for your "house". *Administrative issues journal: connecting education, practice, and research*, 4(2), 7.

Pallant, J. (2010). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS* (4th ed.). London, UK: McGraw-Hill.

University of Venda

Parliament of United Kingdom: *The Protection from Harassment Act 1997,* (2017) available at https://researchbriefings.parliament.uk/ResearchBriefing/Summary/SN06648. Accessed June 17, 2020.

Parsefall, M.R., & Salin, D. M. (2010). Perceptions of and reactions to Workplace Bullying: A social exchange perspective. *Human Relations*, *63*(3), 761–780.

Petherick, W. (2017). "Victim Precipitation: Why we need to expand upon the theory." *Forensic Research and Criminology International Journal*, *5*(2), 263-264.

Pietersen, C. (2007). Interpersonal bullying behaviours in the workplace. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, *33*(1), 59-66.

Pilch, I., & Turska, E. (2015). Relationships between Machiavellianism, organizational culture, and workplace bullying: Emotional abuse from the target's and the perpetrator's perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *128*(1), 83-93.

Podsiadly, A., & Gamian-Wilk, M. (2017). Personality traits as predictors or outcomes of being exposed to bullying in the workplace. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *115*, 43-49.

Proskauer, (2013). Bullying, Harassment and Stress in the Workplace. *A European Perspective.* http://www.internationallaborlaw.com/files/2013/01/Bullying-Harassment-andStress-in-the-workplace-A-European-Perspective.pdf.

Queensland Workplace Bullying Taskforce (2001). *Workplace bullying: Issues paper*. Brisbane: The Department of Industrial Relations

Rahi, S. (2017). Research design and methods: A systematic review of research paradigms, sampling issues and instruments development. *International Journal of Economics & Management Sciences*, *6*(2), 1-5.

Rai, A., & Agarwal, U. A. (2018). "A review of literature on mediators and moderators of workplace bullying: Agenda for future research". *Management Research Review*, 41(7), 822-859.

Rammstedt, B., & John, O. P. (2007). Measuring personality in one minute or less: A 10-item short version of the Big Five Inventory in English and German. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *41*(1), 203-212.

University of Venda

Raths, J. (2001). *Teachers' beliefs and teaching beliefs. Early childhood research and practice*., from http://ecrp.uluc.edu/v3n1/raths.html. Accessed July 15, 2015.

Rauthmann, J. F., & Sherman, R. A. (2015). Ultra-brief measures for the Situational Eight DIAMONDS domains. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*.

Rauthmann, J. F., & Sherman, R. A. (2016). Measuring the Situational Eight DIAMONDS characteristics of situations: An optimisation of the RSQ-8 to the S8*. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, *32*(2), 155-164. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000246.

Rayner, C. (1997). The incidence of workplace bullying. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 7(3), 199-208.

Rayner, C. (2000) "Building a business case for tackling bullying in the workplace: beyond a basic cost-benefit approach", in Sheehan, M., Ramsay, S. & Patrick, J (Eds.) *Transcending Boundaries: Integrating People, Processes and Systems*. Proceedings of the 2000 Conference, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia. Brisbane: Griffith University, 26-31.

Reknes, I., Einarsen, S. V., Gjerstad, J., & Nielsen, M. B. (2019). Dispositional affect as a moderator in the relationship between role conflict and exposure to bullying behaviours. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10(1), 1-12. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00044.

Richard, J. F., Schneider, B. H., & Mallet, P. (2012). Revisiting the whole-school approach to bullying: Really looking at the whole school. *School Psychology International*, 33(3), 263-284.

Roland, E., & Munthe, E. (Eds.). (2017). *Bullying (1989): An International Perspective*. Routledge.

Rosander, M., & Blomberg, S. (2018). *The WHOLE picture: Measurement of psychosocial work environment*. Linköping University Electronic Press.

Rossiter, L., & Sochos, A. (2018). Workplace Bullying and burnout: The moderating effects of social support. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment and Trauma*, 27(4), 386–408.

University of Venda

Roter, A. B. (2011). *The lived experiences of registered nurses exposed to toxic leadership behaviours* (Doctoral dissertation, Capella University).

Rouse, L. P., Gallagher-Garza, S., Gebhard, R. E., Harrison, S. L., & Wallace, L. S. (2016). Workplace bullying among family physicians: A gender focused study. *Journal of Women's Health*, *25*(9), 882-888.

Saberi, H. R., Motalebi Kashani, M., & Dehdashti, A. (2019). Occupational violence among female workers in an Iranian industrial area. *Women and health*, *59*(9), 1075-1087.

Salin, D. (2001). Prevalence and forms of bullying among business professionals: A comparison of two different strategies for measuring bullying. *European journal of work and organisational psychology*, *10*(4), 425-441.

Salin, D. (2003). Ways of explaining workplace bullying: A review of enabling, motivating and precipitating structures and processes in the work environment. *Human relations*, *56*(10), 1213-1232.

Salin, D. (2008). The prevention of workplace bullying as a question of human resource management: Measures adopted and underlying organizational factors. *Scandinavian journal of Management*, *24*(3), 221-231.

Salin, D. (2015). Risk factors of workplace bullying for men and women: The role of the psychosocial and physical work environment. *Scandinavian journal of psychology*, *56*(1), 69-77.

Salin, D. (2021). Workplace bullying and gender: An overview of empirical findings. *Dignity and inclusion at work*, 331-361.

Salin, D., & Hoel, H. (2011). Organisational causes of workplace bullying. *Bullying and harassment in the workplace: Developments in theory, research, and practice*, 2, 227-243.

Salmivalli, C., Kärnä, A., & Poskiparta, E. (2011). Counteracting bullying in Finland: The KiVa program and its effects on different forms of being bullied. *International Journal of Behavioural Development*, *35*(5), 405-411.

University of Venda

Samnani, A. K., & Singh, P. (2016). Workplace Bullying: Considering the interaction between individual and work environment. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *139*(3), 537-549.

Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2016). *Research methods for business: A skill building approach*. John Wiley & Sons.

Sherman, R. A., Nave, C. S., & Funder, D. C. (2013). Situational construal is related to personality and gender. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *47*(1), 1-14.

Shi, J., Lin, H., Wang, L., & Wang, M. (2009). Linking the big five personality constructs to organisational justice. *Social Behaviour and Personality: An International Journal*, *37*(2), 209–222.

Shropshire, J., Warkentinm., & Sharma, S. (2015). Personality, attitudes, and intentions: predicting initial adoption of information security behaviour. *Computers and Security,* 49, 177–191.

Smit, D. M. D. (2021). The double punch of workplace bullying/harassment leading to depression: legal and other measures to help South African employers ward off a fatal blow. *Law, Democracy and Development*, 25, 24-63.

Smit, D.M. (2014). *Bullying in the workplace: Towards a uniform approach in South African labour law*. Unpublished PhD thesis. University of the Free State, Bloemfontein.

Snelson, C. L. (2016). Qualitative and mixed methods social media research: A review of the literature. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *15*(1), 1609406915624574.

Social Modernization Act. (2002). See Lloyd *French law prohibiting bullying in the workplace* (2013) available at https://www.thehrdirector.com/business-news/diversity-and-equality-inclusion/french-law-prohibiting-bullying-in-the-workplace. Accessed June 17, 2020.

Soto, C. J., & Jackson, J. J. (2013). *Five-factor model of personality*. Oxford University Press.

University of Venda

South African Police Service. (2017). SAPS Head Office Wachthuis Building 231 Pretorius Street Pretoria, GPS Coordinates: S25.74790 E28.18901. Retrieved November 21, 2017.

Spielberger, C. D. (1983). State-trait anxiety inventory for adults.

Spielberger, C. D. (1996). *State-trait anger expression inventory-II: professional manual*. Odessa, FL, USA: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Staff, Hope and Justice Project, "Hope and Justice Project 2012)" (2012). *Maine Women's Publications* - All 627. https://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/maine_women_pubs_all/627.

Staff. (2017). Zambia Former First Lady Calls for End of Sexual Harassment at Workplace, Demands Equal Pay: *The Afrolutionist, Zambia.*

Steinman, S.M. (2003). Bullying in South Africa. In Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., & Cooper, C. (Eds.). (2002). Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace: *International perspectives in research and practice*. CRC press.

Strandmark, K. M., & Hallberg, L. R. M. (2007). The origin of workplace bullying: experiences from the perspective of bully victims in the public service sector. *Journal of Nursing management*.

Tag-Eldeen, A., Barakat, M., & Dar, H. (2017). Investigating the impact of workplace bullying on employees' morale, performance and turnover intentions in five-star Egyptian hotel operations. *Tourism and Travelling*, *1*, 4-14.

Tepper, B. J., Duffy, M. K., Henle, C. A., & Lambert, L. S. (2006). Procedural injustice, Victim Precipitation, and abusive supervision. *Personnel Psychology*, *59*(1), 101-123.

Tharp, D. T., Seay, M. C., Carswell, A. T., & MacDonald, M. (2020). Big five personality traits, dispositional affect, and financial satisfaction among older adults. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *166*, 110211. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2020.110211.

Thoms, P., Moore, K. S., & Scott, K. S. (1996). The relationship between self-efficacy for participating in self-managed workgroups and the big five personality dimensions. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, *17*(4), 349-362.

Ⓒ University of Venda

Todd, E. R. (2014). Personality and the Construal of Situations (Doctoral dissertation, UC Riverside).

van der Westhuizen, M. (2021). *Personality and workplace bullying: Role of the Big Five Personality Traits in Predicting Workplace Bullying Perpetrators in South Africa* (Doctoral dissertation), Stellenbosch University.

Vandekerckhove, W., & Commers, M. S. R. (2003). Downward workplace mobbing: A sign of the times? *Journal of Business Ethics, 45*(1–2), 41–50.

Vartia, M. (1996). The sources of bullying–psychological work environment and organisational climate. *European journal of work and organisational psychology*, *5*(2), 203-214.

Vega, G., & Comer, D. R. (2005). Sticks and stones may break your bones, but words can break your spirit: Bullying in the workplace. *Journal of business ethics*, *58*(1), 101-109.

Velázquez, M., & Jain, A. (2021). The Role of Work Environment Authorities in the Dynamics of Workplace Bullying, Emotional Abuse and Harassment. In: D'Cruz P. et al. (eds) *Pathways of Job-related Negative Behaviour*. Handbooks of Workplace Bullying, Emotional Abuse and Harassment, 2, 525-553. Springer, Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-0935-919.

Vickers, M. H. (2006). Towards employee wellness: Rethinking bullying paradoxes and masks. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, *18*(4), 267-281.

Visagie, J. C., Havenga, W., Linde, H., & Botha, A. (2012). The prevalence of workplace bullying in a South African mining company. *South African Journal of Labour Relations*, 36(2), 62-75.

Von Bergen, C. W., Savaletta, J. A., & Soper, B. (2006). Legal remedies for workplace bullying: Grabbing the bully by the horns. *Employee Relations Law Journal*, 32(3), 14-40.

Wärnich, S., Carrel, M. R., Elbert, N. F., & Hatfield, R. D. (2018). *Human resource management in South Africa*. 6th ed. Cengage Learning.

Watson, D., & Clark, L. A. (1984). Negative affectivity: The disposition to experience aversive emotional states. *Psychological Bulletin*, *96*(3), 465-490.

Watson, J. B., & Kimble, G. A. (2017). *Behaviourism*. Routledge.

Weiss, H. M., & Kurek, K. E. (2003). Dispositional influences on affective experiences at work. In M. R. Barrick & A. M. Ryan (Eds.), *Personality and work: Reconsidering the role of personality in organizations*, 121–149. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Windholz, E. (2020). Victoria's new workplace manslaughter laws: it's all in the messaging. *Employment Law Bulletin*.

Work Australia Bullying. (2019) available at https://www.safeworkaustralia.gov.au/bullying. Accessed June 17, 2020.

Work Dignity Institute. (2000). About workplace bullying, violence and people problems. *Institute of People Management.* projects@worktrauma.org.

Workman-Davies, B. (2020). Workplace bullying: *Remedies and recourse in South African Law*. Retrieved from The South African Labour Guide: https://www.labourguide.co.za/law-firms/werksmans-attorneys/2686 workplacebullying-remedies. Accessed August 20, 2020.

Zapf, D. (1999). Organisational, workgroup related, and personal causes of mobbing/bullying at work. *International Journal of Manpower*, 20, 70-85.

ANNEXURE A: LETTER TO CONDUCT A STUDY

Permission for conducting a study at your workplace

Enquiries: Makgopa MJ   Private Bag X5050

Cell: 071 431 8283/083 404 3110   Thohoyandou

Email: makgopamj@yahoo.com   0950

                                                                          July 2020

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

REQUEST TO CONDUCT A STUDY

I write to seek your permission to conduct a study on workplace behaviour among police officers in your District for Master of Commerce dissertation in Human Resource Management, University of Venda. I would like to indicate that respondents will only participate willingly, personal information will be kept confidential, and anonymity will be assured.

Your permission will be much appreciated.

Kind regards,

Makgopa Mokwape Jane

University of Venda

ANNEXURE B: SAPS APPROVAL

South African Police Service *Suid Afrikaanse Polisiediens*

Privaatsak Private Bag X94	Pretoria 0001	Faks No. Fax No.	(012) 334 3518

Your reference/U verwysing:

My reference/My verwysing: **3/34/2**

THE HEAD: RESEARCH
SOUTH AFRICAN POLICE SERVICE
PRETORIA
0001

Enquiries/Navrae:

Lt Col Joubert
AC Thenga

Tel: **(012) 393 3118**
Email: **JoubertG@saps.gov.za**

APPROVED

Ms MJ Makgopa
UNIVERSITY OF VENDA

RE: PERMISSION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH IN SAPS: SITUATIONAL AND DISPOSITIONAL FACTORS INFLUENCING WOKPLACE BULLYING AMONG POLICE OFFICERS IN LIMPOPO PROVINCE, SOUTH AFRICA: UNIVERSITY OF VENDA: MASTERS DEGREE: RESEARCHER: MJ MAKGOPA

The above subject matter refers.

You are hereby granted approval for your research study on the above mentioned topic in terms of National Instruction 1 of 2006.

Further arrangements regarding the research study may be made with the following office:

The Provincial Commissioner: Limpopo:

- **Contact Person:** Lt Col Montjane
- **Contact Details:** (015) 290 6300/6090

Kindly adhere to paragraph 6 of our attached letter signed on the **2021-06-30** with the same above reference number.

MAJOR GENERAL
THE HEAD: RESEARCH
DR PR VUMA

DATE: 2021-08-02

ANNEXURE C: ETHICAL LETTER

ETHICS APPROVAL CERTIFICATE

RESEARCH AND INNOVATION
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

NAME OF RESEARCHER/INVESTIGATOR:

Ms MJ Makgopa

STUDENT NO:
19020910

PROJECT TITLE: **Situational and dispositional factors influencing workplace bullying among Police Officers in Limpopo Province, South Africa.**

ETHICAL CLEARENCE NO: SMS/21/HRM/02/0306

SUPERVISORS/ CO-RESEARCHERS/ CO-INVESTIGATORS

NAME	INSTITUTION & DEPARTMENT	ROLE
Prof SS Babalola	University of Venda	Supervisor
Mr W Munyeka	University of Venda	Co - Supervisor
Ms MJ Makgopa	University of Venda	Investigator – Student

Type: **Masters Research**
Risk: **Minimal risk to humans, animals or environment (Category 2)**
Approval Period: **May 2021 – May 2023**

The Research Ethics Social Sciences Committee (RESSC) hereby approves your project as indicated above.

General Conditions
While this ethics approval is subject to all declarations, undertakings and agreements incorporated and signed in the application form, please note the following.
* The project leader (principal investigator) must report in the prescribed format to the REC:
    – Annually (or as otherwise requested) on the progress of the project, and upon completion of the project
    – Within 48hrs in case of any adverse event (or any matter that interrupts sound ethical principles) during the course of the project.
    – Annually a number of projects may be randomly selected for an external audit.
* The approval applies strictly to the protocol as stipulated in the application form. Would any changes to the protocol be deemed necessary during the course of the project, the project leader must apply for approval of these changes at the REC. Would there be deviated from the project protocol without the necessary approval of such changes, the ethics approval is immediately and automatically forfeited.
* The date of approval indicates the first date that the project may be started. Would the project have to continue after the expiry date; a new application must be made to the REC and new approval received before or on the expiry date.
* In the interest of ethical responsibility, the REC retains the right to:
    – Request access to any information or data at any time during the course or after completion of the project,
    – To ask further questions; Seek additional information; Require further modification or monitor the conduct of your research or   the informed consent process.
    – withdraw or postpone approval if:
    – Any unethical principles or practices of the project are revealed or suspected.
    – It becomes apparent that any relevant information was withheld from the REC or that information has been false or misrepresented.
    – The required annual report and reporting of adverse events was not done timely and accurately,
    – New institutional rules, national legislation or international conventions deem it necessary

ISSUED BY:
UNIVERSITY OF VENDA, RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE
Date Considered: April 2021

UNIVERSITY OF VENDA
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR
RESEARCH AND INNOVATION
2021 -06- 0 4
Private Bag X5050
Thohoyandou 0950

Name of the RESSC Chairperson of the Committee: Prof Takalani Mashau

Signature:

SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES AND LABOUR RELATIONS
INFORMATION SHEET AND INFORMED CONSENT FORM

I am Makgopa Mokwape Jane, a registered Masters' student at the University of Venda for Master of Commerce in Human Resource Management (MCOM). You are invited to participate in the study on workplace behavior, which is basically for academic purposes. I would like to indicate that every information given will not be disclosed to anyone without your consent.

Be informed that you will only reply to questions that are following the topic and that participation is voluntary. You are reminded that you have the right to withdraw from participation should you feel that the statement items are indecent. There would not be any penalty for that decision.

In terms of the University of Venda ethical requirements, you are invited to complete this form as an indication of your permission to participate voluntarily.

 INFORMED CONSENT FORM

I, _____hereby confirm that I have been fully informed about the purpose, procedures, and activities of the study. The rights and the risks of employees' participation have also been fully explained to me. I was given full opportunity to ask any questions, and I understand that participants can withdraw from the study at any stage and time, without giving any reasons.

I therefore freely **GIVE/Do not give** my consent to participate in the study as outlined voluntarily (**Delete the inapplicable).**

Signature: ....　　　　**Date:** ....

ANNEXURE E: RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRES

Thanks for agreeing to take part in this questionnaire. I am Makgopa Mokwape Jane, a registered master's student at the University of Venda, in Human Resource Management and Labour Relations Department. I am researching workplace behaviour in police organizations. The research is being done to fulfill the requirements of a master's degree in Human Resource Management. The information provided will be kept in the strictest confidentiality.

Section A: Demographical and Occupational Information

1. Are you Male /Female -----------------------

2. How old are you (years) --

3. Race: Black -------------- Colored ----------- Whites ----------- Indian ------- Other (specify)----

4. Highest educational qualification: --------------------------------

5. How long have you been working for this organization? ------------------------

6. Position ------------------------

7. Type of appointment type: Full Time ---------------- Temporary/Contract -----------

Section B: Workplace Bullying (NAQ-R)

Each of the statements below refers to something that a person might say about his or her job. Please indicate your personal views on to what extent you agree with each of the statements.

These statements describe your interactions with your co-workers. For each statement item, please rate the frequency with which you experience the following interactions by CIRCLING the appropriate number. CIRCLE ONE: 1 Daily; 2 Weekly; 3 Monthly; 4 Occasionally; 5 Never.

		DAILY	WEEKLY	MONTHLY	OCCASIONALLY	NEVER
WPB1	Someone withholding information which affects your performance	1	2	3	4	5
WPB2	Being humiliated or ridiculed about your work	1	2	3	4	5
WPB3	Being ordered to do work below your level of competence	1	2	3	4	5
WPB4	Having key areas of responsibility removed or replaced with more trivial or unpleasant tasks	1	2	3	4	5
WPB5	Spreading of gossip and rumors about you	1	2	3	4	5
WPB6	Being ignored or excluded	1	2	3	4	5
WPB7	Having insulted or offensive remarks made about your person, your attitudes, or your private life	1	2	3	4	5
WPB8	Being shouted at or being the target of spontaneous anger	1	2	3	4	5
WPB9	Intimidating behaviors such as finger-pointing, invasion of personal space, shoving, blocking your way	1	2	3	4	5
WPB10	Hints or signals from others that you should quit your job	1	2	3	4	5
WPB11	Repeated reminders of your errors or mistakes	1	2	3	4	5
WPB12	Being ignored or facing a hostile reaction when you approach	1	2	3	4	5
WPB13	Persistent criticism of your errors or mistakes	1	2	3	4	5
WPB14	Having your opinions ignored	1	2	3	4	5
WPB15	Practical jokes carried out by people you don't get along with	1	2	3	4	5
WPB16	Being given tasks with unreasonable deadlines	1	2	3	4	5
WPB17	Having allegations made against you	1	2	3	4	5
WPB18	Excessive monitoring of your work	1	2	3	4	5
WPB19	Pressure not to claim something to which by right you are entitled (e.g. sick leave, holiday)	1	2	3	4	5

WPB20	Being the subject of excessive teasing and sarcasm	1	2	3	4	5
WPB21	Being exposed to an unmanageable workload	1	2	3	4	5
WPB22	Threats of violence or physical abuse or actual abuse	1	2	3	4	5

Section C: Dispositional Factors (BFI-10)

Key: 1. Strongly Disagree; 2. Disagree; 3. Uncertain; 4. Agree; 5. Strongly Agree

(R = item is reverse scored). I see myself as someone who:

		Strongly disagree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Strongly agree
	Extraversion: 1R, 5					
DF1	Is reserved	1	2	3	4	5
DF2	Is generally trusting	1	2	3	4	5
	Agreeableness: 2, 7R					
DF3	Tends to be lazy	1	2	3	4	5
DF4	Is relaxed handles stress well	1	2	3	4	5
	Conscientiousness: 3R, 8					
DF5	Has few artistic interests	1	2	3	4	5
DF6	Is outgoing, sociable	1	2	3	4	5
	Neuroticism: 4R, 9					
DF7	Tends to find fault with others	1	2	3	4	5
DF8	Does a thorough job	1	2	3	4	5
	Openness to Experience: 5R, 10					
DF9	Gets nervous easily	1	2	3	4	5
DF10	Has an active imagination	1	2	3	4	5

University of Venda

Section D: Situational Factors

Key: 1. Strongly Disagree; 2. Disagree; 3. Somewhat Disagree; 4. Neutral; 5. Somewhat Agree; 6. Agree, and 7. Strongly Agree.

Duty									
SF1	Minor details are important.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
SF2	Task-oriented thinking is required.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
SF3	I am pressured to fulfill my duties.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Intellect									
SF4	Information needs to be deeply processed.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
SF5	There is a lot of intellectual stimuli.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
SF6	There is an opportunity to demonstrate my intellectual capacities.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Adversity									
SF7	I am frequently threatened by someone or something.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
SF8	There is a high potential to be blamed for something.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
SF9	Others often criticize me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mating									
SF10	There is sexual tension.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
SF11	Potential sexual or romantic partners are often present.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
SF12	The physical attractiveness of myself and others is relevant.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Positivity									

SF13	People can often express joy and vitality.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
SF14	Things are usually pleasant.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
SF15	Things are often playful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Negativity								
SF16	There are several frustrations.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
SF17	There are many stressors.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
SF18	Things are frequently tense.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Deception								
SF19	It is possible to deceive someone.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
SF20	Someone could be deceptive towards me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
SF21	It is possible to deal with others dishonestly.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Sociality								
SF22	Close personal relationships are essential or can develop.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
SF23	Others show many communicative signals.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
SF24	Communication with other people is essential or desired.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

ANNEXURE F: EDITOR'S LETTER

Office No. 06
Department of English, Media Studies and Linguistics
University of Venda
P/Bag X 5050
Thohoyandou
0950

11 August 2022

To Whom It May Concern

This serves to confirm that I proof-read and edited the master's dissertation titled "Situational and dispositional factors influencing workplace bullying among police officers in Limpopo Province, South Africa" by Mokwape Jane Makgopa, Student Number: 19020910.

Regards

Vincent N. Demana

Department of English, Media Studies and Linguistics
Faculty of Humanities, Social Sciences and Education
University of Venda
Tel: +27- 015 962-8363 Cell: +27-739912237
E-mail: Vincent.demana@univen.ac.za
Website: http://www.univen.ac.za/
A quality driven, financially sustainable, rural-based comprehensive university

Situational and Dispositional Factors Influencing Workplace Bullying

ORIGINALITY REPORT

8%	**6**%	**1**%	**4**%
SIMILARITY INDEX	INTERNET SOURCES	PUBLICATIONS	STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1	hdl.handle.net Internet Source	2%
2	un-pub.eu Internet Source	1%
3	Submitted to University of Stirling Student Paper	<1%
4	Submitted to University of Venda Student Paper	<1%
5	Submitted to University of Johannsburg Student Paper	<1%
6	Submitted to North West University Student Paper	<1%
7	www.separc.co.sz Internet Source	<1%
8	www.scielo.org.za Internet Source	<1%
9	etd.uwc.ac.za Internet Source	<1%